892.06
.A5
O7J

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
JUL 29 1960
PERIODICAN READING ROOM

JOURNAL
OF THE
AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY

EDITOR

EDWARD H. SCHAFER
University of California

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

ERNEST BENDER
University of Pennsylvania

THOMAS O. LAMBDIN
The Johns Hopkins University

VOLUME 80 NUMBER 1 JANUARY–MARCH, 1960

Published March 15, 1960

CONTENTS

STANFORD J. SHAW, Archival Sources for Ottoman History: The Archives of Turkey 1

L. A. SCHWARZSCHILD, Some Indo-Aryan Words Meaning 'All' . . . 13

ARTHUR E. LINK, Shih Seng-Yu and His Writings 17

BRIEF COMMUNICATIONS

HERMAN KÖSTER, Rejoinder 44

W. EBERHARD, Surrejoinder 45

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Franke: *Akten des vierundzwanzigsten Internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses München* (Denzel Carr) 46

Werner: *The Sacred Bridge* (Rev. John H. Miller) 56

Kamali (transl.): *Al-Ghazāli, Tahāfut al-Falāsifah* (Michael E. Marmura) 58

Gode and Karve, ed.: *V. S. Apte's The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Ludwik Sternbach) 59

de Bary, Hay, Weiler, Yarrow: *Sources of Indian Tradition* (Murray Fowler) 64

Dumézil: *L'idéologie tripartie des Indo-Européens* (P.-E. Dumont) 67

Sharma: *Śūdras in Ancient India* (C. von Fürer-Haimendorf) 68

Sankalia and Deo: *Report on the Excavations at Nasik and Jorwe, 1950-51* (Eugene C. Worman, Jr.) 70

Pachow: *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa* (Kun Chang) 71

Caroe: *The Pathans, 550 B.C.–A.D. 1957* (Harold G. Josif) 77

Maity: *Economic Life of Northern India in the Gupta Period* (D. Thorner) 78

Creel, ed.: *Chinese Civilization in Liberal Education* (E. H. Schafer) 80

Te-K'un: *Prehistoric China* (J. A. Pope) 82

Daniels, ed.: *Selections from Japanese Literature (12th to 19th centuries)* (J. K. Yamagiwa) . 86

Jones: *Ages Ago: Thirty-Seven Tales from the Konjaku Monogatari Collection* (C. E. Hamilton) 88

Michener: *Japanese Prints from the Early Masters to the Modern* (E. D. Saunders) 88

American Oriental Society

FOUNDED 1842

OFFICERS FOR 1959-60

President—Professor DANIEL H. H. INGALLS
(Address: Widener Library 273, Harvard University, Cambridge 38, Mass.)
Vice-President—Professor HANS G. GÜTERBOCK
(Address: Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill.)
Secretary-Treasurer—Professor FERRIS J. STEPHENS
(Address: 329 Sterling Memorial Library, Yale Station, New Haven, Conn.)
Editor—Professor EDWARD H. SCHAFER (Far East)
(Address: Department of Oriental Languages, Durant Hall, University of California, Berkeley 4, Calif.)
Associate Editors—Professor ERNEST BENDER (Indic and South East Asia)
(Address: Bennett Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 4, Pa.)
Professor THOMAS O. LAMBDIN (Near East)
(Address: Oriental Seminary, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md.)
Librarian—Professor JAMES T. BABB
(Address: Sterling Memorial Library, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.)
Executive Committee—Professors D. H. H. INGALLS, H. G. GÜTERBOCK, F. J. STEPHENS, E. H. SCHAFER, I. J. GELB (ex officio), T. C. YOUNG (term expires 1960), H. M. HOENIGSWALD (term expires 1961), P. P. DELOUGAZ (term expires 1962)
Delegate to the American Council of Learned Societies—Professor D. H. H. INGALLS (term expires 1960)
Representative on the Board of Trustees of the American Schools of Oriental Research—Professor H. G. MAY
Committee on Nominations—Professor W. N. BROWN, Chairman, Professors H. L. GINSBERG, J. B. PRITCHARD (terms expire 1960), Professors M. J. DRESDEN, L. C. GOODRICH, E. ADELAIDE HAHN (terms expire 1961)

MIDDLE WEST BRANCH

Established 1917

OFFICERS FOR 1959-60

President—Professor IGNACE J. GELB
(Address: Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill.)
Vice-President—Professor FREDERICK P. BARGEBUHR
(Address: State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa)
Secretary-Treasurer—Professor ANDREW S. EHRENKREUTZ
(Address: Department of Near Eastern Studies, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.)
Members of the Executive Committee—Professor TOM B. JONES, Dr. ERICA REINER

WESTERN BRANCH

Established 1951

OFFICERS FOR 1959-60

President—Professor EDWARD H. SCHAFER
(Address: Department of Oriental Languages, University of California, Berkeley 4, Calif.)
Vice-President—Professor GUSTAV VON GRUNEBAUM
(Address: Near Eastern Center, University of California, Los Angeles 24, Calif.)
Secretary-Treasurer—Dr. CHAUNCEY S. GOODRICH
(Address: 660 Spruce St., Berkeley 7, Calif.)
Members of the Executive Committee—Professor W. M. BRINNER, Professor Y. R. CHAO, Dr. L. OLSCHKI, Professor A. TIETZE, Dr. R. F. S. YANG

Books for review should be sent to one of the Editors (addresses and fields of interest listed above). The Editors cannot guarantee to publish reviews in the case of books sent unsolicited, or to return those books to the publishers.

Authors of articles and reviews are expected to conform to the style of *The MLA Style Sheet.*

The Society and the Editors assume no responsibility for the views expressed by authors in the Society's publications.

Issued quarterly. Subscription price, $8.00; single numbers, $2.00.

Annual subscriptions and orders should be sent to the
American Oriental Society, 329 Sterling Memorial Library, Yale Station, New Haven, Conn., U. S. A.

Published by the American Oriental Society, 109 Market Place, Baltimore-1, Maryland. Entered as second-class matter March 1, 1937, at the post office at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Published quarterly.

PRR - Stacks
Cage

ARCHIVAL SOURCES FOR OTTOMAN HISTORY: THE ARCHIVES OF TURKEY

STANFORD J. SHAW
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

THE OTTOMAN ARCHIVES preserved in Turkey offer an immense and virtually unexplored source for the study of the political, economic, and social organization and development of those areas which were under the dominion of the Ottoman Empire during all or part of the last four centuries. In this paper, I propose to indicate the location, nature, and accessibility of each of the principal Ottoman archives in Turkey, and the direction which I believe their development and exploitation should take to ensure their full and proper use.

I. BAŞ VEKÂLET ARŞIVI, Istanbul

Located in the *Defterdârlık* section of Istanbul, on Divanyolu Caddesi. Telephone no. 22582.

Administration. This is the closest equivalent to a National Archives in Turkey, since it includes the archives of several government departments and is under the direct control of the Prime Minister's office. The Acting Director as of February 1959 is Midhat Sertoğlu.

Admission. Foreign researchers must request their own Embassy to submit for them an application to the Turkish Foreign Ministry in Ankara, stating the applicant's credentials and qualifications, the exact subject of research, and, if desired, a request for permission to photograph archival materials pertaining to the research subject. Permission is usually not granted for research subjects pertaining to the years after 1900, but this rule is not invariable.

Hours of Study. Monday through Friday 9 to 12 and 1:30 to 5; Saturday, 9 to 1. The Archives are closed on all official government holidays, but there is no extended annual closing.

Restrictions on the Use of the Archives. Permission for research is granted only for the specific subject stated in the application, and a separate application is needed for permission to consult archival materials not directly concerned with that subject. No more than ten items may be held by the researcher at any one time, whether they be registers or individual documents, and no more than ten items may be requested each day. Modifications of this rule are occasionally made for purposes of photography.

Photographic Facilities. The photostat machine possessed by the archives is available only for official use, and the archives has no microfilm cameras. A photographic dark room is available for outside equipment, and a private photographer has been available for hire for this work. However, he is usually quite busy and long delays are frequent, so it is recommended that students do their own photographic work. It should be noted that microfilm and developer cannot be purchased commercially in Turkey, so the researcher should arrange to bring film with him, whether he plans to hire the commercial photographer or do his own work.

Printed Catalogues and References. Mithat Sertoğlu, *Muhteva Bakımından Başvekâlet Arşivi*, Ankara Universitesi, Dil ve Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları no. 103 (Ankara, 1956). An inventory of materials in the archives. It should be consulted constantly and relevant sections pointed out to the archives personnel. See also Bernard Lewis, "The Ottoman Archives as a source of history for the Arab Lands," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1951, 139-155.

Description of the Principal Collections. Materials preserved in the Ottoman Archives fall into two broad classifications, registers (*defâtır*) and and individual documents (*evrâq*).

A. Registers. There are two basic kinds of registers, those containing copies of orders and decrees, written in *Dîvânî* script, and those containing financial data, written in *Siyâqat* script.[1]

[1] On the problems of Ottoman paleography, see L. Fekete, *Einführung in die osmanisch-türkische Diplomatik der türkischen Botmässigkeit in Ungarn* (Budapest, 1926); L. Fekete, *Die Siyâqat-Schrift in der Türkischen Finanzverwaltung* (Budapest, 1955); Salâhaddin Elker, *Divan Rakamları* (Ankara, 1953); A. Zajacz-

1. *Registers of Orders and Decrees.*

a. The best known and most widely used and publicized of the available Ottoman archival material has been the collection of *Mühimme Defterleri*, a group of 263 registers of widely varying measurements, script, and scope of content, arranged chronologically and running (with gaps) from 961/1553-4 to 1323/1905-6. Summaries and indexes are available for the first sixty-eight volumes of this collection, running from 961/1553-4 to 999/1589-90. Careful examination shows this group to be in fact composed of five different series of registers, emanating from different sources and put together in chronological sequence presumably for purposes of convenience. The most numerous and important series is that containing copies of the orders and decrees of the Imperial Council (*Dîvân-ı Hümâyûn*). The scope of this series alone varies widely through the centuries, reflecting changes in the authority and interests of this body and of this particular series of registers. In the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries it covered the whole range of imperial administrative, political, military, religious, and other matters concerning the entire empire, reflecting the comprehensive scope of the work of the Imperial Council. However, the sheer bulk of work required by an expanding and ever more complicated administrative structure gradually forced a division of the administrative labor, and this process is reflected in these registers. By the start of the eighteenth century, matters of detail were left almost entirely to the administrative departments directly concerned, and are found principally in the registers of those departments rather than in the *Mühimme* registers. Likewise the registration of the work remaining within the scope of the Imperial Council was itself divided geographically into separate series of provincial registers during the eighteenth century:

Province	*Number of Registers*	*Years Included* (A. D./A. H.)
Anatolia	185	1742-1888/1155-1306
Sivas	36	1742-1908/1155-1326
Trabzon	8	1742-1878/1155-1296
Diyarbekir	9	1742-1875/1155-1292
Damascus	9	1742-1908/1155-1326
Adana	9	1742-1878/1155-1295
Karaman	39	1742-1878/1155-1295
Aleppo	9	1742-1881/1155-1298
Erzurum	19	1742-1879/1155-1296
Cezayir	23	1742-1890/1155-1308
Rakka	25	1742-1875/1155-1292
Rumelia	85	1742-1908/1155-1326
Özü and Silistre	49	1742-1877/1155-1294
Istanbul	26	1742-1867/1155-1284
Bosnia	9	1742-1867/1155-1284
Morea	21	1715-1839/1128-1255
Egypt	15	1707-1914/1119-1330

In addition, a special series of registers was set aside to record treaties, letters to and from foreign governments and their representatives in Turkey, and instructions to and reports from Ottoman representatives in foreign countries. These registers are of invaluable assistance to the study of Ottoman foreign relations, especially during the nineteenth century:

Country	*Years covered in the Registers* (A. D./A. H.)
Belgium	1838-1909/1254-1327
Brazil	1857-1906/1274-1324
Bulgaria	1869-1911/1286-1329
Denmark	1756-1915/1170-1334
Dubrovnik/Ragusa	1604-1806/1013-1221
France	1634-1910/1044-1328
Great Britain	1675-1913/1086-1332
Holland	1680-1912/1091-1331
Iran	1822-1912/1238-1331
Italy	1736-1913/1239-1332
Austria-Hungary	1567-1913/ 975-1332
Spain	1781-1808/1196-1223
Sweden	1758-1826/1172-1242
Norway	1736-1912/1149-1331
Montenegro	1902-1905/1320-1323
Poland	1607-1759/1016-1173
Mexico	1865/1282
Prussia	1760-1913/1174-1332
Portugal	1843-1911/1259-1330
Rumania (Eflâq and Boğdan)	1729-1906/1142-1324
Russia	1701-1903/1113-1321
Sardinia	1823-1902/1239-1320
Serbia	1837-1913/1253-1332
Sicily	1740-1859/1153-1276
Tuscany	1832-1859/1248-1276
Greece	1834-1911/1250-1330
Venice	1700-1806/1112-1221

These divisions by subject into special independent series of registers left to the basic *Mühimme* series itself little more than matters concerning the Imperial Council, the Sultan, the Court, military affairs, and general problems of administration and foreign affairs by the middle of the nineteenth century.

Also found intermixed with the registers of the Imperial Council in the *Mühimme* group are

---

kowski, *Zarys Dyplomatyki Osmánsko-Tureckiej* (Warszawa, 1955); S. J. Shaw, "Cairo's Archives and the History of Ottoman Egypt," *Report on Current Research on the Middle East, 1956* (Washington, 1956), pp. 59-72.

registers of military decrees issued by the Sultan and his Grand Vezir during expeditions to Europe and Asia, registers of decrees issued by the *Qâ'immaqâm*, or "substitute" left to rule in the capital during such expeditions, registers containing summaries of the decrees of the Imperial Council, and some registers of appointments and transfers in the various military and political positions in the Empire.[2]

b. The second principal collection of registers of orders and decrees consists of those emanating from the various administrative departments, and which are known in general as *Aḥkâm Defterleri*, or "registers of orders."

This collection contains relatively continuous series of the registers of the principal Ottoman administrative departments from the middle of the sixteenth century until well into the nineteenth century. Like the *Mühimme* registers, these are written in the *Dîvânî* script, but are much bulkier, each volume containing often as many as one thousand folios, and they contain far more detailed information on Ottoman administration. Over two hundred of these *Aḥkâm* registers were available in the *Kâmil Kepeci* collection of the archives by the end of the Second World War. However the archives acquired the bulk of them from the Minister of Finance after the war, and since that time they have been catalogued by subject and date into a collection known as the *Mâliyyeden Müdevvere*.

2. *Financial Registers.* The registers of financial data, which are written for the most part in the *Siyâqat* script, emanate from all the Ottoman administrative departments. They must be regarded as the most important source for the study of Ottoman administrative and military organization, for they provide in a much more detailed, organized, and authoritative way the administrative and financial details from which the information contained in the decrees and orders was extracted.

The types of financial registers available are legion, and only some of the most important can be mentioned here. The *Müfaṣṣal* (Cadastral) registers provide detailed information on the urban and rural population and administrative organization in most of the provinces of the Ottoman empire, especially for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and to a lesser extent for the centuries thereafter. Since the *Siyâqat* script in which they are written lacks entirely the paleographic devices available to distinguish among many letters in the ordinary Arabic script, the necessary decipherment of personal and proper names in them is especially difficult. The *Icmâl* registers contain periodic financial summaries of the revenues and expenditures of the central Imperial Treasury and of the various provincial treasuries from the sixteenth through the nineteenth centuries. And the *Rüznâme* registers contain records of the day-by-day revenues and expenditures of the same treasuries and of various other government departments. In addition, there are registers of the personnel and salaries of the military regiments, the revenues and expenditures of the *evqâf* (religious foundations), *cizye* (poll tax), *iltizâmât* (tax farms), and many more. In general, it can be said that these collections are most complete for Anatolia, Rumelia, Syria, and Iraq for the sixteenth through the nineteenth centuries, and for Egypt, Yemen, and North Africa in smaller quantities and only for the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

These financial registers are found in three principal collections in the *Baş Vekâlet Arşivi*:

1. *Tâpû Defterleri.* Primarily the collection of Cadastral registers, it also contains some *Icmâl* and military salary registers.

2. *Mâliyyeden Müdevvere Defterleri.* This has the largest and most varied collection of financial registers in the archives, and it also includes some *Mühimme* and *Aḥkâm* registers as well as the bulk of the administrative orders and decrees concerning the Imperial Treasury (*Ḫazîne-i 'Âmire*)

[2] In addition to the *Mühimme* registers available in the *Başvekâlet Arşivi*, there are two in the National Library in Vienna:

Mxt. 270, *Mühimme* from *Şevval* 970 to *Zû ul-Ḥicce* 971. 277 folios. A photograph made in the mid-nineteenth century, it is very difficult to read. The location of the original of this register is not known; it is not in the *Baş Vekâlet Arşivi*.

Mxt. 683. *Mühimme* from *Şevval* 1085 to *Ramaḍân* 1086. 224 folios.

In the *Top Kapı Saray* library in Istanbul (Koğuşlar collection no. 888) there is a volume which superficially resembles a *Mühimme* register, and which covers the period from *Muḥarrem* 959 to *Muḥarrem* 960, earlier than any *Mühimme* register in the *Baş Vekâlet Arşivi*. However careful examination reveals this register in fact to have come from the branch of the Ottoman administration which was concerned with foundations (*Evqâf*), rather than from the Imperial Council.

itself from 1066/1655-6 until well into the nineteenth century.

3. *Kâmil Kepeci* Collection.

4. Some financial registers are also found in the *Ali Emirî* and *Ibn ul-Emin* document collections, referred to below.

B. The Documents Collections. The *Başvekâlet Arşivi* is estimated to have in its possession about forty million documents, of which about one-tenth have been catalogued and made available for research. Many of the documents are duplicates or draft copies of the orders and decrees in the registers, and in many cases four or more versions of the same decree can be found. It should be essential in the cataloguing of these documents that these variants of individual decrees be gathered together and correlated with their final copies found in the registers. This would be of great assistance to those wishing to study the administrative process within the departments or the development of specific policies or orders, and it would also bring into managable limits the number of documents or groups of related documents which the archives staff must catalogue and which the researcher must consult. Likewise before detailed research can be made into these materials on a large scale, studies must be made and dictionaries prepared of the administrative terms peculiar to these official materials and of the various symbols and marks applied to the documents by the different departments and officials.

In addition to the various decrees contained in the documents collection, there are also innumerable private letters, reports from ambassadors and merchants abroad, *Ḥucces* issued by the courts in matters touching all aspects of Ottoman society, pages and sections from registers, and other papers of all descriptions. The archives also has a collection of books and papers in Greek, Latin, French, Armenian, Hebrew and other non-Islamic languages. However, these have not yet been catalogued and are not available for study.

The document stores and their catalogues have been divided into five different Classifications (*Taṣnîf*), each of which was named after the director of the committee which compiled it.

1. *Ali Emîrî Tasnifi.* Compiled between 1918 and 1921 by a committee directed by the famous Ottoman historian 'Alî Emirî (1857-1924).[3] There are 180,316 items in this collection, of which approximately one fifth were removed in later years for insertion into later classifications and one-fifth are small receipts (*tezkires*) which are of relatively minor use. This committee arranged the documents and registers which it found chronologically according to Sultan, but with no further classification by year or by subject within the period of each Sultan. This collection contains the oldest items in the archives, a few papers attributed to the reign of the founder of the Ottoman dynasty, Osman I (1299-1326), and its catalogues are indexed for the sultans through Sultan Ibrahim (1640-1648). However, by far the bulk of the documents come from the two centuries between the reign of his son Mehmed IV (1648-1687) and Maḥmud II (1808-1839), and there are a few scattered documents from the time of his son 'Abd ul-Mecîd (1839-1861).[4] The catalogues of this collection are available only in handwriting in the Arabic script.

2. *Ibn ul-Emîn Tasnifi.* Compiled in 1921 by a committee headed by the well-known Ottoman historian Ibn ul-Emîn Maḥmûd Kemâl (1870-1957),[5] this is the smallest of the classifications, containing 46,467 items. It includes both registers and documents, many of which were removed from the Ali Emirî collection, and its catalogues are arranged according to the following general subjects: *Adliye* (justice), *Askeri* (military affairs), *Bahriye* (naval affairs), *Dahiliye* (internal affairs), *Darbhane ve meskukat* (the Mint and coinage), *Defatir-i atika* (miscellaneous old registers), *Müsted'iyat* (petitions), *Muhallefat* (estates and inheritance), *Muharrerat-ı hususiye* (private papers), *Muafiyât ve imtiyazât* (exemptions and privileges), *Saray* (palace), *Ensab* (genealogies), *Hariciye* (foreign affairs), *Hatt-ı Hümâyun* (imperial rescripts), *Hil'ât* (honorific dress), *Maadin* (mines), *Maliye* (financial matters), *Sihhiye* (health), *Şükr-ü şikâyet* (thanks and complaints), *Tevcihat* (appointments), *Timar ve zeamet* (fiefs), *Vakıf* (foundations), *Umûr-u*

[3] See Aḥmed Refîq, "Alî Emîrî Efendî," *TOEM*, VI (1340/1921), 47-51; and Franz Babinger, *Die Geschichtsschrieber der Osmanen und Ihre Werke* (Leipzig, 1927), pp. 402-404.

[4] For full details on the number of items included under the reign of each Sultan, see Sertoğlu, *Muhteva Bakımından*, pp. 68-69.

[5] See Ibrahim Alaettin Gövsa, *Türk Meşhurları Ansiklopedisi* (Istanbul, 1946), p. 187.

Nafia (public works).[6] But within these classifications there is no subdivision or index by year or specific subject, so the researcher will find it imperative to read through all the catalogues to find all the materials available concerning his subject of interest. The documents run from the fifteenth through the nineteenth centuries, with the bulk coming from the late eighteenth century. These catalogues likewise are available only in handwriting in the Arabic script.

3. *Cevdet Tasnifi.* Compiled between 1932 and 1937 by a committee headed by the late Muallim Cevdet (1883-1935),[7] this classification has 184,256 items and is the largest, most useful and easiest to use of those now available for research. It contains a much larger proportion of orders and papers not duplicated in the registers, chiefly reports coming from the provinces and from foreign countries, and it has far fewer of the relatively useless receipts (*tezkere*) which are prevalent in the other classifications. Also its geographic scope is much wider, and it has a far greater number of documents concerning the Arabic countries under Ottoman rule, including North Africa. However, while it has some documents from the seventeenth century, the bulk of the collection comes from the late eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth centuries. And it is especially important for its information concerning the administrative and military reforms instituted in the Ottoman Empire under Selim III (1789-1807) and Mahmud II (1808-1839). Like the Ibn ul-Emin collection, its catalogues are classified by general subject, but their number was reduced: *Adliye* (justice), *Askeri* (military), *Bahriye* (naval), *Belediye* (municipal), *Dahiliye* (interior), *Darphane* (mint), *Evkaf* (foundations), *Iktisat* (economics), *Maliyye* (finance), *Hariciye* (foreign), *Sihhiye* (health), *Nafia* (public works), *Saray* (palace), *Timar* (fiefs), *Zaptiye* (police), *Eyalet-i mümtaze* (Eflak, Boğdan, Egypt and others), and *Maarif* (education).[8] Again, there are no indices or classification by date, subject or geographical area. However, while these also were originally compiled on cards written in the Arabic script, they all have been transcribed by typewriter into the Latin script and are much more convenient for the western student to use. Most of the documents have been exhaustively summarized in the catalogues, and many of them are copied in full.

4. *Hatt-ı Hümâyan Tasnifi,* or "collection of Imperial Rescripts." Approximately ten thousand documents running from the start of the eighteenth century until well into the nineteenth century, with materials of special importance on the reigns of Mahmud II and 'Abd ul-Mecid, the Wahabbi movement in Arabia and the French invasion of Egypt. Despite the name of the collection, it includes not only Imperial decrees, but also a very important collection of communications (*arẕ-ı hâl*) sent to the Sultan from representatives and correspondents abroad. Catalogues are available in the Latin script only, each item is summarized in detail, and the documents are classified according to year and subject.

5. *Fekete Tasnifi.* The most recent classification of documents was begun in the year 1935 under the direction of the distinguished Hungarian Turcologist, Lajos Fekete. Originally the documents were divided into three great classifications:

a. *Müteferrike.* Miscellaneous documents running from 716/1316-7 to 1012/1603-4.

b. *Bâb-ı Defteri.* Administrative and financial documents. Classified from 1012 to 1100/1688-9.

c. *Bâb-ı Âsafi.* Political documents, classified from 1012 to 1102/1671-2. Within each of these categories, the documents were arranged chronologically without regard for individual subject or origin. It was on the basis of this system that the classification of documents in the archives was resumed during the Second World War. However, within these three great classifications, an effort is now being made to reconstruct the archives of each administrative department. At present, documents in this collection are available up to 1102/1671-2. It is especially important for studies of the internal structure of the Ottoman treasury and the imperial financial and administrative system.

6. *Yıldız Tasnifi.* The first five collections run only to the middle of the nineteenth century and are full only until the year 1839. For the years after that time, we must look to the archives of the Yıldız Palace, which are now in the possession of the *Baş Vekâlet Arşivi.* When these archives were

[6] See Sertoğlu, *Muhteva Bakımından,* p. 70.

[7] See Osman Ergin, *Muallım Cevdetin Hayatı, Eserleri ve Kütüphanesi* (Istanbul, 1937).

[8] See Sertoğlu, *Muhteva Bakımından,* p. 71.

first transferred there, an effort was made by the archivists to replace the original departmental classifications in which the papers had been arranged and to divide them into artificial subject classifications as had been done for the Ibn ul-Emin and Muallim Cevdet classifications.[9] However, this has now been halted, and an effort is being made to rearrange these archives into their original classifications, as is now being done for the older documentary collections. It is hoped that this reclassification will be completed in two or three years, but until that time, research in it has had to be suspended. It is to be fervently hoped that these archives, which are so vital for the study of Ottoman history in the crucial half-century before the First World War, will soon be made available for historical research.

II. TOP KAPI SARAYI ARŞIVI, Istanbul.

These are the archives of the court and treasury of the Sultan and his family, located in the fabled Grand Seraglio, called Top Kapı Sarayı in Turkish, which was the principal residence of the Ottoman sultans from the conquest of Istanbul until the middle of the nineteenth century when the Yıldız palace was built.

Administration. General Director, Haluk Y. Şehsuvaroğlu. Archivist, Dursun Kırac. Telephone 24598 and 29818.

Admission. Application should be made to the Director of the Museum or to the Department of Museums and Antiquities (*Müzeler ve Eski Eserler Müdürlüğü*) of the Ministry of Education in Ankara.

Hours of Study. Monday through Friday, 9 to 12 and 1:30 to 4:30, Saturdays, 9 to 12. The archives are open three days a week during the Summer, and the Museum is closed on all official government holidays.

Photographic Equipment. The archives has a microfilm machine and a photographer which are however, available only for official work. Private photographers may bring their own equipment with the permission of the Director.

Printed Catalogues. Tahsin Öz, *Arşiv Kilavuzu*, Istanbul, 2 vol, 1940. This catalogue is compiled in the form of an index to the principal subjects mentioned in the registers and documents. The two volumes which are published cover only the letters A through H, with the rest remaining in four handwritten volumes which are available on request in the library of the palace. They should be used with extreme caution, for the items were not very exhaustively indexed under all the subjects covered in them. Students are advised to attempt to consult as many items as possible which they think might have the remotest connection with their subject.

These archives contain the bulk of the available material on the organization and finances of the Sultan's personal household. However, as the distinction between the Sultan and the state administration were never entirely defined, so there can be found here materials of the same type as those in the *Baş Vekâlet Arşivi*, from all branches of the administration and all parts of the Empire. Likewise the latter has many documents and registers concerning the imperial family. This archive possesses the remnants of the personal correspondence of most of the sultans from the late fifteenth century and thereafter, and it has long reports concerning political conditions and military operations in the various parts of the Empire to a much greater extent than does the *Bâşvekâlet Arşivi*.

Among the collections of interest stored in the *Top Kapı Sarayı Arşivi* are the following (with their archives classifications numbers in parenthesis):

1. Letters exchanged between Ḫâyr Bey and Sulṭân Selîm I (1512-1520), leading to the Ottoman conquest of Syria and Egypt in 1517. (E. 5594, 5483, 5850, 9654, 5596, 5808, 6196, 11355, 5807).

2. Annual summaries of the revenues and expenditures of the central Ottoman treasury (D. 10085, 9893, 6430, 3083, 8974, 3082, 3084, 9051, 569, 8103, 8047, 8058, 8038, 479, 10618, 5908, 3086, 9191, 8577, 3496, 2849, 4944, 4948, 4091, 4193).

3. Annual summaries of the personal treasury of the Sultan (*Enderûn Hazînesi*), from 923/1517 to 1205/1791-2. (D. 6, 7, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 2175, 2178, 7845; 132, 2053, 3141, 4165, 7942, 8318, E. 3329, 442, 9151, 11,863.)

4. Registers of the day-by-day personal expenses of the Sultan, from 1089/1678 to 1292/1875. (D. 60, 118, 242, 331, 336, 343, 352, 358, 375, 382, 388, 397, 399, 400, 401, 458, 516, 554,

[9] See above, page 4.

777, 1037, 2009, 2018, 2111, 2273, 2598, 3112, 4108, 4946, 7193, 9005, 9006, 9151.)

5. Annual summaries of the revenues and expenditures of the provincial Ottoman treasuries, from 947/1540 to 1267/1851. (D. 6878, 3418, 8278, 164, 4019, 3459, 9657, 316, 315, 314, 9661, 178, 179, 180, 483, 9379, 6226, 5162, 10259, 8822, 2788, 4018, 5623).

III. TAPU VE KADASTRO ÜMÜM MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ ARŞIVI, Ankara.

Administration. These are the archives of the Cadastral Department, under the authority of the *Eski Kayıtlar* bureau of this Department, and they are located on the second floor of the *Temyiz Mahkemesi* building in Ankara.

Admission. Requests for permission to consult materials and make photographs in these archives should be made to the Department. American students can facilitate their application by directing it through the American Embassy in Ankara.

Hours of Study. Monday through Friday, 9 to 12 and 1:30 to 5; Saturday 9 to 1. No extended annual vacation, but the archives are closed on all official government holidays.

Photographic Equipment. The archives has a photostat machine, but it is for official use only. Arrangements can occasionally be made for the work to be done by the photographic department of the National Library (*Milli Kütüphane*) in Ankara, which has the best microfilm equipment in Turkey, by the student himself, or by a private photographer.

Catalogues. There are no printed catalogues. Materials are listed in handwritten summary catalogues available in the readers' room. Materials for the eighteenth century and before are listed in a catalogue entitled *Kuyudu Kadimi Fihrisi.*

Description of the Collections. The bulk of the collection consists of cadastral registers of most parts of the Ottoman empire, running from the sixteenth through the nineteenth centuries. These registers are still in use for governmental and legal reference. There are also financial registers of the *Efqâf* (foundations), financial summaries (*Icmâl*) of the central and provincial Ottoman treasuries, and *Rüznâme* registers of their daily receipts and expenditures.[10] Individual documents are available only from the middle and late nineteenth century.

There are 327 assorted registers available for Anatolia, 159 for Rumelia, and 25 for the islands of Crete, Rhodes, Cyprus, and others in the Eastern Mediterranean. In addition, the following materials are available concerning the Arab countries under Ottoman rule (the number of registers in each category are indicated in parenthesis):

Province	*Vaqf registers*	*Cadastral registers*	*Icmâl registers*
Jerusalem (Quds)	1	2	1
Damascus (Şâm)	1	3	1
Tripoli (Trablus Şâm)	3	2	1
'Aclûn	–	1	2
Ḥamâ	–	1	1
Ḥoms	–	1	1
Cebeliyye	–	1	–
Sâfid	–	1	1
Ma'ra	–	1	1
Gaza	–	1	1
Nablus	1	1	1
Bağdad	2	1	2
Kerkuk	–	1	1
Mosul	–	1	1
Basra	–	1	1
Aleppo	–	4	1

In addition, there are 855 *Rüznâme* registers from all parts of the Empire, including 265 from the Arab provinces mentioned above, running from 1106/1693-4 to 1327/1907-8.

IV. ŞARIYYE MAHKEMESI ARŞIVI.

Archives of the religious courts.

For the first time we come to materials not emanating directly from the administrative offices of the Ottoman government. However, the Qâḍîs had a definite administrative function, and this is reflected in their registers. Aside from their judicial duties, it was the task of the Qâḍîs to supervise, certify and register various administrative actions and orders, and in addition the Qâḍîs seem to have had important positions in the various financial departments of the central government. Research is still needed to determine more exactly the administrative role of the Qâḍîs and the nature and origin of the administrative materials copied in their registers.

In general, these registers contain the following types of materials:

1. Details of pleas entered in the Qâḍîs courts and of the decisions which were made.

[10] See above, page 3.

2. Certification and verification of official and private documents and actions, the details of which are set down in the registers.

3. Registration in detail of the properties of merchants, soldiers, officials, and learned men, including much information on their lives, properties and positions in society, the organization of the military, religious and economic groups, and the administrative and financial organization of urban and rural areas.

4. Economic information on prices, taxes, coinage, the movement of trade and the like.

The materials in the administrative archives previously mentioned were written by members of a scribal institution, rigorously trained in certain methods of writing and penmanship.[11] The script in which they wrote was regular in form throughout the centuries of Ottoman rule. However it appears that the scribes in the religious courts were not similarly trained in a regular system of calligraphy. The scripts in which the judicial registers are written vary widely, are quite irregular, and present far greater difficulties of decipherment than do those in the administrative registers. However the material contained in these registers is of such importance for the study of the political, social and economic structure and development of the Ottoman empire that these difficulties must be surmounted and the materials in these archives consulted during the course of research.

Administration. The archives of the religious courts in Turkey were placed under the administration of the Museums section of the Ministry of Education (*Maarif Vekâleti, Eski Eserler ve Müzeler Müdürlüğü*) in Ankara, to which requests for admission should be made.

Photographic Equipment. No photographic equipment is available in any of the places where these archives are located, but permission is usually granted to private and commercial photographers.

Catalogues and Arrangement. There are no printed catalogues. In the various archives, the registers are arranged according to size, location of the court, and date of the register, in that order.

Locations of the Archives. The archives of the various courts were gathered in various district centers by a decree issued on the 3rd of October 1941. Since that time, the bulk of these archives were transferred to Ankara and Istanbul.

1. The *Müftülük* of Istanbul, formerly the chief religious court of that city, now possesses approximately 12,000 registers from the courts of Istanbul and its environs, running from the sixteenth through the twentieth centuries, the majority of which come from the last two centuries. Catalogues and indices for this collection have been prepared by Halil Sahilicioğlu, an Assistant in the Institution of Turkish Economic History, University of Istanbul, but these have not yet been published.

2. The *Top Kapı Sarayı*, Istanbul.

District	*Number of Registers*	*Dates Covered* (A. D./A. H.)
Edirne	684	1539-1856/ 945-1272
Ayvalık	1	1911-1914/1328-1331
Bafra	5	1892-1911/1309-1328
Balıkesir	109	1544-1894/ 950-1311
Bartin	11	1888-1908/1306-1325
Bayramiç	6	1870-1908/1286-1324
Biga	13	1831-1906/1246-1322
Bolu	263	1669-1890/1079-1306
Burhaniyye	27	1726-1911/1138-1329
Çanakkale	12	1831-1878/1246-1294
Divrik	9	1887-1911/1304-1329
Duzce	31	1885-1886/1302-1303
Eceabad	5	1886-1911/1303-1329
Edremit	103	1516-1907/ 921-1323
Ezine	7	1848-1911/1264-1327
Gebze	30	1712-1901/1123-1317
Gerede	10	1840-1910/1255-1328
Gonen	11	1886-1923/1303-1340
Gorele	40	1850-1911/1266-1329
Goynuk	24	1742-1911/1154-1329
Giresun	49	1859-1921/1275-1338
Hope	1	1894-1910/1311-1328
Izmit	10	1806-1911/1220-1329
Mesudiye	6	1872-1923/1288-1340
Mudurnu	7	1816-1909/1231-1325
Ordu	2	1902-1913/1319-1330
Pazar	10	1863-1920/1279-1339
Rize	23	1854-1915/1270-1332
Kodoscuk	245	1547-1882/ 953-1298
Samsun	43	1786-1921/1200-1340
Sindirgi	7	1893-1913/1310-1330
Tirebolu	10	1792-1914/1206-1331
Trabzon	297	1556-1917/ 963-1334
Zafranbolu	45	1785-1908/1199-1324
Zonguldak	13	1823-1910/1238-1326

3. *Ankara Etnografya Müzesi* (Ankara Museum of Ethnography).

[11] On the scribal institution and its techniques, see Mahmud Kemal Inal (Ibn ul-Emin), *Son Hattatlar* (Istanbul, 1955); and Ḥabîb, *Ḫaṭṭ ve Ḫaṭṭâṭân* (Istanbul, 1305/1888).

District	*Number of Registers*	*Dates Covered* (A. D./A. H.)
Ankara	319	1584-1910/ 991-1326
Ayaş	34	1754-1926/1167-1343
Kalecik	7	1835-1908/1250-1324
Beypazarı	87	1882-1921/1299-1340
Çankiri merkezi	76	1655-1913/1065-1330
Çerkes	10	1841-1911/1256-1327
Çorum Merkezi	16	1840-1911/1255-1327
Egin	36	1785-1912/1199-1329
Eskişehir Merkezi	102	1870-1893/1286-1309
Ahisa	1	1817-1827/1232-1241
Sivrihisar	69	1807-1925/1221-1342
Bogazliyan	1	1889-1905/1306-1321
Gumuşhane	2	1885-1912/1302-1329
Yozgat	30	1881-1917/1298-1334
Kayseri	289	1490-1916/ 895-1333
Çiçekdağı (Mecidiye)	2	1907-1912/1324-1329
Kırşehir	24	1876-1915/1292-1332

4. *Diyarbekir Müzesi.* 252 registers from Diyarbekir, Elazig, Hakkari, and Bitlis.

5. *Van Müzesi.* An undetermined number from Van and Ağri.

6. *Adana Müzesi.* 424 registers from Adana, Urfa, Gaziantep, Maraş, Içel and Malatya.

7. *Hatay Müzesi.* 101 registers from Hatay.

8. *Konya Müzesi.* 329 registers from Konya, Burdur and Isparta.

9. *Niğde Müzesi.* 22 registers from Niğde.

10. *Afyonkarahısar Müzesi.* 158 registers from Afyonkarahısar and Denizli.

11. *Sivas Müzesi.* 121 registers from Sivas.

12. *Kütahya Müzesi.* 90 registers from Kütahya.

13. *Bursa Müzesi.* 827 registers from Bursa and Bilecik. Mostly microfilmed by Professor Ömer Lütfi Barkan, Director of the Institute of Turkish Economic History, University of Istanbul.

14. *Manisa Müzesi.* 297 registers from Manisa.

15. *Izmir Müzesi.* 179 registers from Izmir, Aydın, and Muğla.

16. *Antalya Müzesi.* 46 registers from Antalya.

17. *Kastamonu Müzesi.* 207 registers from Kastamonu.

18. *Sinop Müzesi.* 23 registers from Sinop.

19. *Tokat Müzesi.* 107 registers from Tokat and Amasya.

In the long run, these Qâḍîs archives should prove to be the most valuable of all for information on the social and economic development and life of the Ottoman empire. But their full exploitation must await further centralization and cataloguing of the collections and solution of the numerous paleographic problems which have arisen in them.[12]

V. OTHER OFFICIAL ARCHIVES IN TURKEY.

1. Ministry of Foreign Affairs (*Hariciye Vekâleti*). These archives run from the early nineteenth century to 1924 and are stored at the *Baş Vekâlet Arşivi* in Istanbul. However, the Ministry has not yet permitted researchers to consult them.

2. The Naval Museum (*Deniz Müzesi*) located in the Kasımpaşa section of Istanbul, has a large collection of papers and documents running from the 10/16th century to the end of the nineteenth century. Permission for their use can be secured from the Director of the *Top Kapı Sarayı* in Istanbul.

3. The Turkish State Mint (*Darbhane*), located in the buildings of the old Ottoman Mint next to the *Top Kapı Sarayı* in Istanbul, possesses important materials on Ottoman coinage and prices from the start of the nineteenth century to the present time. Materials from before 1826 have been transferred to the archives of the *Top Kapı Sarayı*. Permission to consult the archives of the Mint must be secured from the Ministry of Finance in Ankara.

4. The Department of Religious Foundations (*Vakıf Müdürlüğü*) has a large collection of *Vaqf* financial registers and deeds running from the middle of the fifteenth century until the end of the nineteenth century. Most of these are stored in the Department's Istanbul offices, but some have been transferred to it's main office in Ankara.[13]

5. The Ministry of War (*Harbiye Vekaleti*) possesses archives running from the start of the sixteenth century until the middle of the nineteenth century, stored for the most part in a building in the *Sultanahmed* section of Istanbul, but

[12] My thanks to the Directors of the *Eski Eserler ve Müzeler Müdürlüğü* and the *Ankara Etnografya Müzesi* in Ankara and the *Top Kapı Sarayı* museum in Istanbul for the information presented here on the Qâḍîs' archives in Turkey.

[13] Many of the documents in this archives have been published by the Ministry of Vaqfs in various books and in its journal, *Vakıflar Dergisi* (I/1938, II/1942, III/1956, IV/1957).

some of the more recent files, especially those on the First World War, are now held in the main building of the Ministry in Ankara.[14]

6. Archival materials in the Muallım Cevdet manuscript collection of the Municipal Library (*Belediye Kütüphanesi*) at Bayezid square in Istanbul. Collected by the compiler of the third *Tasnif* at the *Baş Vekâlet Arşivi*,[15] this series of approximately one thousand registers and documents includes some of the oldest archival materials available in Istanbul. Some items of interest are:

O. 62—Register of Ottoman foot soldiers (*piyâdegân*) in the province of Qarası in 937/1530-1. 103 folios.

O. 82. Register of *Timârs* (fiefs)in Anatolia for the years from 903/1497 to 906/1501.

O. 71. *Defter-i maşraf-ı ceyb-i hümâyûn.* Register of the personal expenditures of the Sultan and his family from 909/1503 to 929/1523. 218 folios.

K. 184. Register of the names of all the officials of the Imperial Council (*Divan-ı Humâyun*) from 1222/1807 to 1238/1822, and copies of many of their official documents and personal letters.

B. 35. Financial register of the revenues and expenditures of the arsenal (*tersâne*) at the fortress of Temişvar in the year 1110/1698. 100 folios.

O. 65. Register of taxes collected in the province of Rumeli in 924/1518. 98 folios.

O. 91. Register of the revenues and expenditures of the central Ottoman treasury in the years 1493-1494/898-899. 496 folios.

K. 326. Register of judicial districts and judges in Rumelia in 1266/1849. 62 folios.

O. 77. *Qânûnnâme* (code of laws) for the city of Istanbul in the year 904/1498-9. 179 folios.

K. 122. Register (*Sicill*) from the Qâḍî's court in Istanbul for the year 985/1577. 232 folios.

O. 66. Register of Tax Farms (*Muqâṭa'ât*) in Anatolia and Rumelia in the year 1061/1650. 33 folios.

B. 4. Register of salaries and personnel in the Imperial Palace during the time of Sultan Mahmud II (1808-1839).

B. 21. Population figures for Rumeli and Anadolu in 1062/1651.

O. 79. Cadastral survey of the provinces of Kutahya, Aydın, Bolu, Tekke and Qara Hısar for the year 878/1473.

0. 93. Cadastral survey of the province of Galibolu for the year 879/1474. 87 folios.

O. 83. Register of all the religious endowments (*Evqâf*) in Egypt immediately after the Ottoman conquest, Dated 936/1529.

VI. Personal and Family Archives.

The archives mentioned above contain official records alone, with only a few exceptions. Balanced research in Ottoman history is seriously limited by an absence of the archives of individuals who participated in Ottoman political, administrative, and military life. I was able to locate and examine in Istanbul only three large personal archives of historical value.

A. *Köprülü* family archives, located in the Köprülü public library in Istanbul. There are a number of registers of the private and official correspondence of some of the Köprülü vezirs:

II. O. 291. Register of Köprülüzâde Muṣṭafa Paşa, from 1676/1087 to 1682/1092. 179 folios.

II. K. 293. Register of Köprülüzâde Nu'mân Paşa, from 1708/1120 to 1712/1123. 320 folios.

II. O. 364. Register of Köprülüzâde Nu'mân Paşa from 1733/1146 to 1735/1147. 51 folios.

II. O. 292. Register of Köprülüzâde Nu'mân Paşa from 1736/1149 to 1738/1151. 151 folios.

B. Papers of the Ottoman historian and statesman, Cevât Paşa (1851-1900),[16] possessed by the Archaeological Museum of Istanbul. His private administrative reports and papers have been bound together into volumes arranged chronologically:

MSS no. 1346. 1872-1880/1288-1296.
MSS no. 1347. 1878-1883/1294-1299.
MSS no. 1348. 1882-1893/1299-1309.
MSS no. 1653. 1892-1894/1309-1310.

[14] Many of the documents in the Military Archives have been published and used for articles in the *Askeri Mecmuası* (Military Journal) or its historical supplement (*Askeri Mecmuasi Tarihi Kısmı*). References to many of these publications can be found in Enver Koray, *Türkiye Tarih Yayınları Bibliyografyası* (Ankara, 1951); and a complete list is found in *Askerî Neşriyat kataloğu* (Istanbul, 1939). See also *Harb Tarihi Vesikaları Dergisi* (26 fasc., 1953-1960).

[15] See above, page 5.

[16] See Bursalı Mehmed Tâhir, *'Osmanlı Mu'ellifleri* (Istanbul, 1333-1342/1915-1924), III, 43; and Babinger, *Geschichtsschreiber*, pp. 382-3.

MSS no. 1654. 1894-1895/1311-1312.

MSS no. 1655-1659. Miscellaneous notes and papers from the years between 1878/1294 and 1895/1311. Not in chronological order.

MSS no. 1660. Register of telegrams sent in 1874-1890/1289-1306.

MSS no. 505. Register of the revenues and expenditures of the imperial treasury in 1307/1890-1.

MSS no. 524. Register of the revenues of the Sultan in 1302/1886-7.

MSS no. 1350. Register of decrees of the Ottoman Grand Vezirs from 1754/1167 to 1759/1171.

C. Papers of the Ottoman historian and administrator Ahmed Cevdet Paşa,[17] possessed by the Municipal Library (*Belediye Kütüphanesi*) of Istanbul.

1. In the *Cevdet Yazmaları* collection:

K. 136. Report on problems of tax collection and Arab tribes in the area of Syria between Damascus and Aleppo, compiled by Cevdet while he was governor of the province.

O. 5. A forty-eight page article on affairs in the Hicâz, written by Cevdet Paşa in 1277/1860. Much of his information for this article was secured from the papers of Ferik Reşit Paşa, who previously had been sent to Arabia on a special mission by the Ottoman government.

B. 1 and B. 32. Cevdet Paşa's reports on his inspection of administration in the provinces of Bosnia and Hersek.

B. 31. An article on events in Kozan and Gavurdağı.

2. In the *Cevdet Paşa Evrakı* collection. The original manuscripts of the memoirs of Cevdet Paşa.[18]

Volume	*Pages*	*Dates*	*Principal Subjects*
I	29	1840-1856/1255-1271	Internal reforms.
II	101	1856-1857/1271-1272	Internal reforms and the Paris conference of 1856.
III	81	1856-1857/1271-1272	Events in Arabia and the Caucasus.
IV	85	1856-1860/1272-1275.	Miscellaneous events.
V	56	1859-1862/1275-1278	Ottoman financial problems. Cevdet's administrative policies in the province of Işkodra.
VI	59	1859-1862/1275-1278	Cevdet's policy in the province of Işkodra.
VII	47	1862-1864/1278-1279	Ottoman financial problems. Cevdet's inspection of the provinces of Bosna and Hersek.
VIII	48		His reforms in Bosna and Hersek.
IX	42		The same.
X	43		The same. And the start of his reforms in Kozan.
XI	57		Reforms in Kozan. Administrative problems in Syria.
XII	49		Cevdet Paşa's term as Superintendent in the Ministry of Justice. Vali of Maraş.
XIII	37	1823-1850/1238-1265	Autobiography.
XIV	38	1849-1853/1265-1268	Autobiography.
XV	34	1852-1856/1268-1271	Autobiography.
XVI	37	1856-1872/1272-1287	Autobiography.
XVII	66	1872-1877/1288-1292	Autobiography.
XVIII	59	1876-1882/1292-1298	Autobiography.
XIX	76	1881-1887/1298-1303	Autobiography.
XX	84	1886-1890/1303-1306	Autobiography.
XXI	43	1889-1896/1306-1312	Autobiography.

Other important papers in the same collection:

MS No.

22 His report on reforms at Kozan, part IV, 23 pp.

23 Same, part V, 17 pp.

24 Same, part VII. Also events while he was governor of Aleppo and other events in the year 1876/1292. 27 pp.

25 Report on Kozan, part VIII. Events of

---

[17] See K. Sussheim, "Djevdet Pascha," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, I, 197-8; and Ali Olemezoğlu, "Cevdet Paşa," *Islam Ansiklopedisi*, III, 114-123.

[18] These memoirs have recently been published in summary form by Cavid Baysun, *Cevdet Paşa Tezâkir 1-12* (Ankara, 1953). While many of the documents for the years 1872-1877/1288-1292 were published anonymously in the *TOEM*, VI (1340/1921), 52-57, 105-120, 186-192, 300-306; VII (1341/1922), 55-72, 269-292, 336-356, 402-416; VIII (1341/1922), 117-132, 165-190, 220-233.

1876-1878/1292-1293. Information on the deposition of Sultan 'Abd ul-Aziz. 63 pp.

26 Cevdet Paşa's report on Işkodra. 47 pp.

27-29 Reports on Bosna and Hersek. 62 pp.

30 Cevdet's secret recommendations on Bosna and Hersek.

35 Letters written while he was governor of Yanya.

47 Report on the office of the *Qâpûdân-ı Deryâ* (Admiral), 70 folios.

49-52, 56 Papers on Ottoman seapower, written during the years 1879-1881/1296-1298 by Cevdet Paşa.

Turkish archival material thus is organized and available for all aspects of Ottoman political, administrative, diplomatic, economic, legal and social history from the fifteenth through the nineteenth centuries, and more such material is constantly being made available. The immensity of these archives and the paleographic difficulties involved in their use make it inevitable that the bulk of research in them will be carried on by scholars of countries whose history is more directly touched by their contents and who are able to spend relatively long periods of time in the archives. However it is to be hoped and expected that Western scholars will also make their contribution and set an example of systematic and organized study and presentation of the materials which are available. It is not in the individual volume or document but in the series of records running over long periods of time that the archives offer the greatest opportunities to scholarship. It is only by systematic study of all the materials available concerning the object of each researcher's interest that truly fundamental studies can be made of the Ottoman system. The Ottoman archives are not organized for those who wish to come to them for a short time to photograph materials concerning their subjects. Months of searching into the catalogues is necessary to locate all available materials concerning each subject, and much longer time is required to gather these materials and mold them into an intelligible unit of study. And all this archival research must be supplemented by detailed study of the published and unpublished Ottoman chronicles which run in an unbroken series from the sixteenth century to the end of the nineteenth century.[19]

The methods and principles of historical research can now be fully applied to Ottoman history. No longer must Ottoman studies be limited to examination and comparison of the often biased, inaccurate, and superficial reports of foreign diplomatic representatives and travellers in the Ottoman empire. These reports can still make a valuable contribution in supplementing, enriching, confirming, and sometimes explaining the information available in the Ottoman chronicles and archives concerning the political, diplomatic and commercial developments in the Ottoman Empire.[20] However it is unlikely that these European reports can make anything more than a superficial contribution to the study of internal Ottoman administrative, economic, social, and cultural organization and development. It is to be hoped that the work of preserving and making available for research the rich archival legacy left by the Ottoman empire will continue, and that scholarly interest in exploiting the material offered will grow

[19] These chronicles are cited in detail in Cemâl ed-Dîn, *'Oşmânlî Mu'errihlerî* (Istanbul, 1314/1896).

[20] The materials available in European archives concerning the Ottoman Empire are described by R. H. Davison, "European Archives as a Source for Later Ottoman History," *Report on Current Research on the Middle East, 1958* (Washington, 1958), 33-45.

SOME INDO-ARYAN WORDS MEANING 'ALL'

L. A. SCHWARZSCHILD

MOOROOLBARK, VICTORIA, AUSTRALIA

MUCH HAS BEEN WRITTEN on words meaning 'all' in the Indo-European languages, from Brugmann's [1] important monograph to recent discussions of the later history of the Latin *totus* and *omnis*.[2] The main interest of these words lies in some peculiarities of declension and in the great variety of methods of expression. According to Brøndal's [3] classification the idea of totality involves four subsidiary notions:

1. Completeness: (Latin *totus*), 'whole,' 'all.'
2. Universality: (Latin *omnis*), 'all.'
3. A distributive or iterative meaning: (Latin *quisque*), 'every,' 'each.'
4. Generality: (Latin *quisquam*), 'any.'

Languages do not necessarily distinguish between these notions, and even when they do there are frequent transitions from one subsidiary meaning to the other among words used to express totality. The liveliest, most expressive and on the whole most easily replenished group of these words is that which expresses completeness. Often adjectives of completeness tend to be used gradually to express universality, and later they may become iterative or be reduced to a vague general meaning. Such developments have taken place in Indo-Aryan as much as in Romance and elsewhere.

The unaccented word *sama* was already in process of disappearing in Vedic. It conveyed the meaning of every' and 'any' and was sometimes a very weak indefinite pronoun, *e. g.*, in R. V. 9. 29. 5 b *samasya kasya cit* 'of any' quoted by Wackernagel.[4] There are indications from other Indo-European languages and particularly from Avestan (Avestan *hama* 'all") that this word had originally designated completeness and universality.

The Vedic adjective *śaśvat* 'ever-recurring' sometimes had the meaning of 'all' and 'every,' *e. g.*, in R. V. 7. 18. 18 *śaśvantas śatravas* 'all the foes.' *śaśvat* is even found in the phrase *śaśvatīṣu vikṣu* 'in all the habitations' which is clearly equivalent to the more usual Vedic expression *viśvāsu vikṣu*. In the classical language the adjective *śaśvat* is obsolete but it survives in adverbial form as *śaśvat* 'always.'

Viśva like *sama* was probably at first an adjective meaning 'whole.' [5] In Vedic it covered all the subsidiary notions of totality (except to some extent that of generality) and was much used. In later Vedic and the Brāhmaṇa period *viśva* lost ground gradually to *sarva* and was restricted to fixed locutions and archaising phrases in classical Sanskrit.

Sarva [5a] had originally been yet another adjective indicating completeness as is shown by the cognate Avestan *haurva*, English *whole*, etc. It was the most widely used adjective of totality in Sanskrit and covered the subsidiary notions.

Despite the virtual disappearance of the Vedic *sama, viśva* and the adjective *śaśvat*, there was no shortage in Classical Sanskrit of words meaning 'all' though they expressed mainly the subsidiary notion of completeness. The most important of these words was *sakala*, which has sometimes also assumed a universal and distributive meaning. More definitely restricted to the sense of completeness were *samasta, samagra, akhila* and *sampūrṇa*.

Middle Indo-Aryan in this respect, as in other features of vocabulary resembles Sanskrit rather than Vedic. Descendants of *viśva* therefore occur but rarely and then only in specialised usages:

[1] K. Brugmann, *Die Ausdrücke für den Begriff der Totalität in den indogermanischen Sprachen.* Progr. (Leipzig, 1893-4).

[2] S. Andersson, *Études sur la syntaxe et la sémantique du mot français 'tout.'* Etudes Romanes de Lund (Lund, 1954).

[3] V. Brøndal, 'Omnis et Totus: analyse et étymologie.' *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à M. H. Pedersen.* Acta Jutlandica, Aarskrift for Aarhus Universitet (1937), pp. 260-268.

[4] J. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, III (Göttingen 1930), 582.

[5] J. Wackernagel, *ibid.* refers to Zubatý *I. F.*, XXV, 201.

[5a] See also J. Gonda, 'Reflections on Sarva- in Vedic Texts,' *Chatterji Jubilee Volume, Indian Linguistics* 16 (1955).

vissa < *viśva* is found in some archaising formulae in Pali.[6] In Jaina Prakrit it is usual only in proper names, *e. g., Vissasena* and *Vissabhūi*, which are mentioned a number of times in the Śvetāmbara canon. The form *vīsa* < *viśva* is due to a sporadic sound change[7] in Ardha-Māgadhī and Māhārāṣṭrī and occurs also in proper names in the canon, *e. g., Vīsaseṇa* in the Sūyagaḍanga, 1. 6. 22. As in Sanskrit there is no sign in the literary Prakrits of descendants of Vedic *sama* and of the adjective *śaśvat*.

In Middle Indo-Aryan it was the descendants of *sarva* that were most frequently used to express totality. Of the Sanskrit words that denoted the subsidiary notion of completeness *akhila* does not seem to have been popular in Middle Indo-Aryan. It was used mainly in stylised works such as the Gauḍavāho where it occurs in the form *ahila* and it was also occasionally used as a tatsama in other texts. *Sayala, sagala* < *sakala* was more common, but in quite a few cases it also appears as a tatsama or semi-tatsama. Sanskrit *samasta* became *samattha* in Prakrit by the ordinary phonetic development. This word was too much alike in form and meaning with *samatta* < *samāpta* 'complete,' 'finished' not to be confused with it. How complete this confusion was can be seen from the fact that Hemacandra derived *samatta* from *samasta* and endeavored to explain this by an unusual change of *-st-* to *-tt-* instead of *-tth-* (Hemacandra 2. 45). As a result of this confusion the Prakrit derivatives of *samasta* did not become important as adjectives of totality. *Sampuṇṇa* < *sampūrṇa* was still felt as a compound of *pūrṇa* 'full' and was therefore kept more in the specialised sense of 'complete,' 'full' rather than as an ordinary adjective of totality, while *samagga* < *samagra* also does not seem to have become usual or popular.

There was thus in Middle Indo-Aryan only one word that covered all the subsidiary notions of totality: Prakrit *savva*, Pali *sabba*, while *sayala* and some less usual words *ahila, samagga* and *samatta* indicated completeness. Late Apabhraṃśa texts show the emergence of a new adjective of totality, *sāhu*. This word is given by Hemacandra in the rule *sarvasya sāho* (4. 366) '*sāhu* is optionally substituted for *sarva*.' It also occurs in a verse quoted under this rule. This verse is almost identical with verse 88 of the earlier Pāhuḍadohā[8] of Rāmasiṃha, though there *sayalu* is used instead of *sāhu*. *Sāhu* is found a few times in the plural but on the whole it is an adjective of completeness occurring mainly in the singular and it is not much declined. *Savve, savvi* < *sarve* is used for the plural and also indicates the subsidiary notions of totality. In some later texts, such as the Paumasiricariu of Dhāhila and the Carcarī of Jinadatta *sahu* appears with a short *a* and the Old Gujarati form corresponding to it is *sahu*. There is still some uncertainty as to the origin of this word.

The most widely accepted theory is that of Pischel[9] who derives *sāhu* from Sanskrit *śaśvat*. To strengthen this theory Berger[10] quotes an intermediate form *sāsa*. Tessitori,[11] Modi[12] and others follow a similar explanation to that of Pischel.

Hemacandra equated the word *sāhu* with *sarva*, and this view was taken up again by Dave[13] who derived the Old Gujarati *sahu* from Sanskrit *sarva*, Pkt. *savva*, Apabhraṃśa *sava*, with the addition of *hu*, a derivative of the Sanskrit particle *khalu* used for emphasis.

Although it has gained the support of so many scholars the theory that *śaśvat* became *sāhu* in Apabhraṃśa has a number of weaknesses. Some of these are phonetic. Berger (*loc. cit.*) stated that the lengthening of the *a* was not clear, but there are plenty of parallel cases (*e. g.*, those quoted by Pischel, *loc. cit.*), and it seems that the simplification of a sibilant plus *-r-* or *-v-* with compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel was not unusual in Ardha-Māgadhī, Jain Māhārāṣṭrī and Māhārāṣṭrī (cf. *vīsa* for *viśa* quoted previ-

[6] The Pali formula *vissaṃ dhammaṃ* quoted in this respect by J. Wackernagel, *loc. cit.*, was even misunderstood by the commentator of the Dhammapada, so unknown was *vissaṃ* < *viśvaṃ*. Cf. W. Geiger, *Pali Literatur und Sprache* (Strassburg 1916), § 113.

[7] R. Pischel, *Grammatik der Prakritsprachen* (Strassburg 1900), § 64.

[8] G. V. Tagare in his *Historical Grammar of Apabhraṃśa* (Poona 1948), p. 447 quotes *sahu* as occurring in verse 89 of this text, but H. L. Jain's edition has *savu*.

[9] R. Pischel, *op. cit.*, §§ 64 and 262.

[10] H. Berger, *Zwei Probleme der mittelindischen Lautlehre* (Munich 1955), p. 80.

[11] L. P. Tessitori, 'Grammar of the Old Western Rajasthani' *Indian Antiquary*, 1914-16, § 96.

[12] *Gurjararāsāvalī*. Edited by Thakore, Desai and M. C. Modi (Baroda 1956). Glossary, *s. v. sahu*.

[13] T. N. Dave, *A study of the Gujarati Language in the 16th century* (London 1935), p. 35 and p. 190.

ously). More serious is the objection that *sāhu, sahu* appears always as such. There is no indication anywhere that the *-h-* had originally been a sibilant although the word is particularly well established in areas where the change of *s* to *h* made least impact (Gujarat). One might argue that this was a case where the change of *s* to *h* was facilitated by the presence of another sibilant which caused dissimilation. The most obvious example of such a development that could be cited is the verb **śās-* 'to tell' which nearly always appears as *sāh* -rather than *sās-* in Middle Indo-Aryan. Such a dissimilation is not impossible for *śaśvat* > **sāsa.* Nevertheless the complete absence of forms of this word with a simple *-s-* or of any other intermediate form [14] makes the derivation of *sāhu* from *śaśvat* unlikely.

Pischel and those who followed his explanation were concerned mainly with phonetic development and did not state clearly whether they thought of the Vedic adjective *śaśvat-* 'ever-recurring,' 'all,' or of the Classical Sanskrit adverb *śaśvat* 'always' as the antecedent of *sāhu.* In either case there are difficulties. Apabhraṃśa *sāhu* is rarely declined, and this might lead one to regard the Classical Sanskrit adverb *śaśvat* as its most probable source, but the change of meaning from 'always' to 'complete, entire, all' cannot claim widespread support from parallel developments. The Vedic adjective *śaśvat-* 'all' offers no semantic difficulties,, but is even less probable as a direct ancestor of the late Apabhraṃśa *sāhu*; so-called Vedic survivals [15] that never penetrated into the literary works of Sanskrit, Prakrit or even early Apabhraṃśa are open to grave doubts.

The difficulties that lie in the way of the more popular explanation do not however vindicate the alternative theory put forward by Dave. The phonetic development of *sarva* + *khalu* to *sāhu* is not clear, particularly as there is no indication that such a combination was frequent either at the Prakrit or the Apabhraṃśa stage of Indo-Aryan.

Sāhu, sahu makes its appearance so late in Apabhraṃśa that it may well be a formation within Apabhraṃśa itself rather than an inherited form. There is evidence in the Apabhraṃśa texts to support this view.

Already in earlier Apabhraṃśa literature there are signs of some phonetic irregularities in the development of *sarva* 'all,' probably owing to the frequent unaccented use of the word. There was reduction of the double consonant to a single consonant, sometimes, as one might expect,[16] with compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel, sometimes without. In the Western Apabhraṃśa of the Pāhuḍadohā and the Bhavisatta-kahā we therefore find *sava* as well as the phonetically regular *savva,* while the Paumacariu and the later Sandeśarāsaka have *sāva,sāvu.* The nominative and accusative singular masculine and neuter is sometimes distinguished further by the loss of the single *-v-* before the final *-u,* and we find *sāu* [17] as well as *sāvu* in the Paumacariu.

The introduction of *h* into *sāu* < *sarva* is probably connected with a morphological peculiarity of this word, which had always had close links in declension with the pronouns. A pronominal ending *-hu* is found frequently in both Western and Southern Apabhraṃśa and also the so-called Eastern Apabhraṃśa of the Bauddha Gan o Dohā. It belongs primarily to the nominative and accusative singular masculine (in Western Apabhraṃśa also neuter) of the demonstrative pronoun *ehu* < Sanskrit *eṣa,* and it was extended from there. It has been introduced into the nominative singular of the second person pronoun *tuhu(ṃ)* in Apabhraṃśa.[18] The final *-hu* appears further in Apabhraṃśa *uhu, ohu* which has been formed on the analogy of *ehu* and which Dr.

[14] There is a doubtful occurrence of *sassa* 'always' < *śaśvat* in an extract from Tribhuvana Svayambhū in the *Apabhraṃśapāṭhāvalī* of M. C. Modi (Ahmedabad 1935), p. 66 v. 143, but this provides no link in form or meaning. The adjective *śāśvata,* based on *śaśvat* is found in both Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa as *sāsaya* 'everlasting,' but not as **sāhaya.* This would indicate that Apabhraṃśa *sāhu* 'all is probably unconnected with this group of words.

[15] Examples of Vedic survivals in Apabhraṃśa are sometimes quoted, such as *kidha,* Prakrit *kiha,* Vedic *kathā.* Most of these examples admit of other explanations: *e. g.,* Vedic *nakīm* and *mākīm* are believed to have given *nāiṃ* and *māiṃ*; yet *māim,* like *sāhu* is not attested until Hemacandra. *Māiṃ* was probably not derived directly from *mākīm*; it was formed on the analogy of the Prakrit *ṇāiṃ,* which itself is unlikely to be derived from the Vedic *nakīm* (cf. *JRAS,* 1959, p. 47).

[16] R. Pischel, *op. cit.,* § 87.

[17] *Paumacariu of Svayambhū,* edited by H. C. Bhayani (Bombay 1953), I, 16. 8. 3. and II, 54. 12. 1.

[18] Ḍhakkī *tuhaṃ* does not seem to be connected with the Apabhraṃśa forms: it is an isolated development due to the influence of the first person pronoun *ahaṃ.*

Bhayani[19] has shown to be the antecedent of the modern Hindi *vah*. L. P. Tessitori[20] suggested that the Old Western Rajasthani indefinite pronoun *keha*, as well as *jeha* and *teha* were also based on *ehu* > Old Western Rajasthani *eha*. The change of the nominative-accusative masculine and neuter *sāu* 'all' to *sāhu* was parallel to all these developments and due to the influence of *ehu*. The insertion of *-h-* separated *sāhu* < *sāu* from the rest of the declension of *savva* < *sarva*. Being a singular *sāhu* was naturally used more to express completeness, while the plural *savve* < *sarve* expressed universality. Ultimately this must have given the speaker the illusion, shared by Pischel and others, that *sāhu* was quite a separate adjective of completeness, unconnected with *savve* < *sarve*, and that its introduction into literary Apabhraṃśa had been favoured by the comparative scarcity of surviving adjectives of totality. We have thus the curious case of an old adjective of universality and totality in general, *savva* < *sarva* splitting into two to form *savve, savvi*, etc., 'all" and *sāhu* 'whole.'

One of the peculiarities of both *sāhu* and *savve* is the lack of declension. This has nothing to do with any possibility of a derivation from *śaśvat*; it is a general feature of the adjectives of totality. There are correspondences to this in other languages *e. g.*, French. The usage originated from the tendency of the word for 'all' to imply 'altogether' or 'completely' and to approximate in this way to an adverb. This comes about especially when the word for 'all' is used with another adjective or a past participle. The beginnings of such a development can be seen for instance in the Paumacariu VII. 7. 4: *kiu pārāuṭṭhau seṇṇu sāvu-* 'the whole army was turned back' or 'the army was completely turned back.' Lack of declension continued in the modern Indo-Aryan languages[21] and as noted by Tessitori it was particularly noticeable in Old Western Rajasthani; in Modern Gujarati *sāv* < *sarva* has in fact become an adverb.

Sāhu was not frequent in Apabhraṃśa but it seems to have increased in importance in Old Western Rajasthani and especially in Gujarati, often with the addition of the emphatic particle *-u*, hence *sahū*. Although it ultimately survived only in this limited area (cf. modern Gujarati *sau*) it has left traces of its influence elsewhere.

Sanskrit *sakala* 'whole,' 'all' appears as a semi-tatsama *sagala* in Apabhraṃśa, but in Old Western Rajasthani more frequently as *saghala*. The aspiration caused Dave to explain this word as derived from Sanskrit *ślāghya* 'praiseworthy' which involves a highly improbable change of meaning. It seems much more plausible that the aspirated consonant was brought about by the co-existance of the word *sagala* 'whole' with *sāhu, sahu* of identical meaning. It is also possible that a similar influence accounts for other irregular aspirations in words meaning 'all.' Modern Indo-Aryan *sab* < *sarva* appears over a large part of Northern India as *sabh*. Such forms including the curious *sambha* occur already in the text of the Ḍākārnava. S. K. Chatterji[22] suggested that this might be due to the influence of the tatsama *sabhā* 'assembly,' but the possibility remains that the Apabhraṃśa *sāhu, sahu* was the cause of this aspirate consonant too.

As *sahu* 'whole,' Gujarati *sau* survives only in such a limited area one would expect to find in Modern Indo-Aryan the introduction of some new adjective indicating the notion of completeness. This has happened with the use of derivatives of the Sanskrit *sāra*: cf. Hindi, Bengali, Panjabi, Lahndā etc. *sārā*[23] 'whole,' 'all.' The beginning of the gradual change of meaning of Sanskrit *sāra* 'essence,' 'best part' to 'whole,' 'all' is already noticeable in Apabhraṃśa, e. g. in the Kumārapālapratibodha of Somaprabha (Sthūlabhadrakathā 14. 1-2 in L. Alsdorf's edition):

jasu ahara-hariya-sōhagga-sāru
naṃ vidduma sēvai jalahi khāru;

'the coral resorts to the bitter ocean, as the best part of its beauty (or 'all its beauty') has been surpassed by her lips,' and 59. 1-2:

mahu-mahuru caēvi nivāhigāru
pēranta-viḍambaṇa dukkha-sāru

[19] H. C. Bhayani, 'Vah, moṭiyār aur bhāp (bhāph).' *Maru Bhāratī* (1958), p. 59.

[20] There is a variant explanation for some of these forms given by M. C. Modi *Gurjararāsāvalī*, Glossary, *s. v. keha*, where he suggests that the particle *hu* < Sanskrit *khalu* was added to the pronominal base. Tessitori's explanation *op. cit.*, § 88 is more convincing.

[21] Cf., for instance, Barburam Saksena, *The Evolution of Awadhi* (Allahabad 1937), p. 205.

[22] S. K. Chatterji, *Origin and Development of the Bengali Language* (Calcutta 1926), p. 319.

[23] J. Bloch in *La formation de la langue marathe* (Paris 1920). Glossary, *s. v., sārā* explains this word as cognate with Sanskrit *sarva*, but this theory has not been usually accepted.

'having abandoned the service of the king which (apparently) is as sweet as honey, but which in the end brings blame and which is *really all* sorrow' (Alsdorf: 'in Wahrheit nur Leiden'). One can see how close this type of phrase is to Hindi usage, particularly in cases where Hindi *sārā* is followed by its noun: *e.g., nisi sāri* 'the whole night' (Padumawatī, edited by Laksmī Dhar 44. 2.).

It thus becomes clear that in spite of the interesting and unusual development of *sāhu, sahu* 'whole,' 'complete' from *savva* 'all' in Apabhraṃśa, Indo-Aryan follows a general scheme of development in which words meaning 'all' are constantly supplemented and ultimately supplanted by words meaning 'whole' or 'complete.'

SHIH SENG-YU AND HIS WRITINGS

ARTHUR E. LINK
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Introduction

One of the most interesting of the early Chinese Buddhist authors, and a man who can be taken as almost a typical example of the learned, urbane, metropolitan clerics of the period of the domestication of Buddhism in China,[1] is the Liang Dynasty monk, Shih Seng-yu. The following paper[2] consists of an integral translation of Seng-yu's biography as presented in the *Kao-seng chuan* (*Lives of Eminent Monks*), a general survey of Seng-yu's major writings, and an annotated translation of Seng-yu's own preface to his principal work, the *Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi* (*Collection of Records on the Translated Tripiṭaka*).

Seng-yu: his Time and Place

Shih Seng-yu died at the age of seventy-four (*sui*) on May 26, A. D. 518 (the seventeenth year of the reign-era *T'ien-chien* of Liang Wu-ti).[3] His long life thus spans the years 445-518 A. D., and extends from the latter years of the (Liu)

[1] I here follow Arthur Wright's periodic classification: ca. 317-589 A. D. See his *Buddhism in Chinese History* (Stanford, 1959), pp. 42-64.

Abbreviations used in this paper as as follows:

BD	Mochizuki Shinkō, *Bukkyō daijiten*. 5 vols. (Tokyo, 1931-32).
BEFEO	*Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-orient* (Hanoi).
BHS	Edgerton, Franklin, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. Vol. II; *Dictionary*. (New Haven, 1953).
CST	Seng-yu, *Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi*.
DKWJT	*Dai kanwa jiten* (Tokyo, 1955-).
FHTTT	Ting Fu-pao, *Fo-hsüeh ta-tz'u-tien* (Shanghai, 1919).
HJAS	*Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*.
HKSC	Tao-hsüan, *Hsü kao-seng chuan*.
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*.
JAS	*Journal of Asian Studies*.
KSC	Hui-chiao, *Kao-seng chuan*.
T.	The *Taishō* edition of the Chinese *Tripiṭaka*.
T'ang, *History*	T'ang Yung-t'ung, *Han wei liang-chin nan-pei-ch'ao fo-chiao shih*. 2 vols. (Shanghai, Commercial Press, 1938).
TP	*T'oung Pao*.

For the Chinese logographs not easily identified appearing in this paper see the alphabetized list appended.

I wish to thank Professor Hajime Nakamura of the University of Tokyo, and Dr. Fang Chao-ying of the University of California for kindness rendered in regard to several points. Since these scholars did not read this paper, they are in no way responsible for any errors of fact or opinion that may have slipped into it. Section five of the present article was presented, in somewhat different form, at the Specialist Session On Inner Asia and Buddhism for the Association For Asian Studies in Washington, D. C., March 24, 1959.

[2] The following notes are intended as no more than preliminary remarks. I have not treated Seng-yu's life, his *CST*, nor the enormously complex problem of early Chinese Buddhist bibliographies in any detailed or extensive fashion, nor have I taken account of all the studies made by Western and Japanese scholars. It is hoped, however, that these marginalia will serve as general background for the translations here presented.

[3] *T.* 50. *KSC.* 11. 402c.

Sung (420-479), through the short-lived Ch'i (479-502), and well into the first third of the Liang (502-557) dynasties. As can be seen from the mere enumeration of these dynasties under which Seng-yu lived, the period of his life was one of great political instability. Compared with the cultural, political, and economic debacle which had taken place a hundred and twenty-eight years prior to his birth, with the loss of all of north China in 317,[4] and the consequent withdrawal of the Chinese elite from their ancient cultural heartland to the relatively "frontier regions" south of the Great River around the modern Nanking, these dynastic changes must have been regarded with some equanimity by the majority of the people involved in them. Particularly was this true since the administrative, social, and cultural patterns seem not to have been greatly disturbed by the ebb and flow of these dynastic tides. Moreover, in many ways southern China was quite different from what it had been under the Eastern Chin. Many of the tensions which had arisen between the old conservative provincial families, long established in the Yangtze Valley and the newly arrived, dispossessed yet sophisticated, émigrés from the northland ultimately were resolved in the creation of a new elite southern culture.[5] No longer was there that agonized air of self-doubt, chagrin, and futility which had characterized the attitude of the earlier Chinese exiles from the north.[6] Although the fiction of legitimacy—the claim to have inherited and continued the Han mandate to rule over a united empire—was piously maintained seemingly all the more strongly as the actualities of the situation apparently precluded all possibilities of its enactment, in reality, the Southern Dynasties did not possess sufficient military power to reconquer the north. (Similarly, the north found itself in a like situation.)[7] The "other mountains and rivers"[8] of the south had been divided into new districts and prefectures sometimes called after the place-names of the north. The Chinese "immigrants" had scattered and settled widely through the fertile valley formed by the Yangtze delta; they had, in some cases, intermarried with people already present in this area, and had reestablished new families proud of their past but already acclimated to their new homeland. For many (perhaps the majority) the north remained no more than memories; few there were who would have joined in a "crusade" to regain their ancient heritage. Moreover, the vigorous life and rather austere landscape of the northland would undoubtedly have been quite disagreeable to many of the new southern aristocrats, accustomed as they now were to the refinements and self-indulgences which the Yangtze Valley, with its rich soil, its softness of hills and lakes, its sub-tropical vegetation, and its pleasant climate, made possible. Intellectually, the contours of this landscape and the quality of this climate largely determined the unique blend of Taoism, Confucianism, and Buddhism which we recognize as distinctly "southern" as contrasted to that produced contemporaneously in the north.[9]

---

[4] The pivotal character of this year has been discussed by Arthur Wright, "Buddhism and Chinese Culture: Phases of Interaction," *JAS*, XVII (1957), 24. Arthur Waley, in describing the fall of the capital to the barbarians, compares it with the sack of Rome by the Goths in 410. See his "The Fall of Loyang," *History Today*, IV (1951), 7-10.

[5] Arthur Wright, *Buddhism in Chinese History* (Stanford, 1959), pp. 44-45.

[6] This mood has been captured in a passage from the *Shih-shuo hsin-yü* (*Ssu-pu pei-yao* ed., 1A.22b), as translated by Wright, "Buddhism and Chinese Culture," 25. There we read that the leaders of the government, having assembled outside the new capital of Chien-k'ang, "they sat on the grass and feasted. Chou Hou sat down among them and said: 'The scenery in general is no different; it is just that there are other mountains and rivers.' They all looked at one another and wept. Only Wang Tao (the Prime Minister, brother of the illfated last Prime Minister of the Western Chin), his expression changing with deep emotion said: 'We should join forces with our royal house and reconquer our homeland. Why sit looking at one another like prisoners in chains?'

[7] In 420 the Eastern Chin Dynasty was brought to its inglorious end by a former general of the royal house, Liu Yü, the founder of the Liu Sung Dynasty. Twenty years later the Northern (or Yüan) Wei succeeded in uniting north China. For approximately the next century and a half the north and south continued to develop widely different cultures and institutions. With the reunification of the nation in 589 by the Sui these north-south distinctions tend to coalesce and disappear.

[8] See above note six.

[9] On the development of a "landscape consciousness" in particular as associated with Buddhist connotations in the poetry of the arrogant and eccentric genius Hsieh Ling-yün (385-433), see the article by Richard Mather, "The Landscape Buddhism of the Fifth-Century Poet Hsieh Ling-yün," *JAS*, XVIII (1958), 67-79. Hsieh's poetry largely reflects the natural beauties of a southern landscape, the loveliness of the Chekiang mountains. It is worth noting that Hsieh was a great admirer of Hui-yüan (334-417), the founder of the Lu-shan community

In general, the older modes of thought and currents of fashion seemed to have been retained longer in the south.[10] This was due in the main to two primary factors. In the first place, as is so frequently the case in peripheral areas, the older provincial families tended to be conservative. And we must remind ourselves that the Yangtze Valley of Seng-yu's day was still a semi-frontier area. Indeed, it has been estimated that when the scattered remnants of the gentry sought refuge south of the Yangtze in the fourth century, "the south contained perhaps a tenth of the population of China."[11] Secondly, the south was not as exposed to foreign incursions and consequent intellectual vagaries as was the north China plain. Thus, in south China as regards Taoism, there was continued the intellectual vogue of considering the "Three Mysteries," namely, the *Lao-tzu, Chuang-tzu,* and the *Canon of Changes* (*I-ching*)—the latter of which stemmed from an entirely different stream of thought—as belonging to one common tradition.[12] Moreover, Confucian concepts were rationalized to accord with these current views of Taoism. For example, though Confucius was declared by many to be the one great sage, he was accorded this exalted position paradoxically because he had realized in himself the "emptiness," which was the leitmotif of contemporary Taoist metaphysics[13] (*hsüan-hsüeh*).

Overshadowing all intellectual life in the south, however, was the gigantic shade cast by Buddhism. Here, too, many of the older modes of thought were retained. Southern Buddhists were still partial to and held in high regard the philosophical fashion of discoursing on "meanings and concepts"[14] (*i-li*), that is to say, they based their arguments mainly on theoretical grounds, rather than on a close adherence to the words of the texts. The literati and the great officials of the court openly associated with monks and carried on the "bequeathed mode" of such leading exponents of the *ch'ing-t'an* (philosophical wit) tradition as Chih Tun[15] and Hsü Hsün. In a word, they continued to interpret Buddhism via Taoist and Confucian ideas.[16]

---

in northern Kiangsi, and the man who did the most for the spread of Buddhism in the south. (He wrote an obituary for him and may actually have met him in 412).

[10] See *inter alia* T'ang, *History*, II, 415 f.

[11] Wright, *Buddhism in Chinese History*, p. 44.

[12] T'ang, *History*, II, 415; Fung Yu-lan and Derk Bodde (tr.), *A History of Chinese Philosophy* (Princeton, 1953), II, 169.

[13] Fung and Bodde, *History*, II, 170-173.

[14] T'ang, *History*, II, 415.

[15] On Chih Tun (314-366), courtesy name (*Tzu*) Tao-lin, see especially his biography *T.* 50. *KSC.* 4. 348b-349c, and T'ang, *History*, I, 177-181; 254-263. References to the personable charm and scintillating wit of Chih Tun are very frequent in the *Shih-shuo hsin-yü.*

[16] On Hsü Hsün, a recluse who had retired to Mount Chiu (in the Yung-chia district of Chekiang), and a man noted for his mastery of "Taoist profundities," see T'an Cheng-pi, *Chung-kuo wen-hsüeh-chia ta-tz'u-tien* (Shanghai, 1935), p. 465, and Hellmut Wilhelm, "A Note On Sun Ch'o and His *Yü-tao-lun*," *Sino-Indian Studies Liebenthal Festschrift* (Santiniketan, India, 1957), p. 264, n. 20.

A man rather closely associated with Hsü Hsün and Chih Tun was Sun Ch'o, whose dates are uncertain. He is said to have died in his fifty-eighth year. Moreover, he wrote epitaphs for Wen Ch'iao (288-329) and for Wang Tao (267-330) supposedly at a time when he had already achieved literary fame. On the other hand, an eulogy for the famous Chin Dynasty monk, Shih Tao-an (312-385), ascribed to him is quoted by Hui-chiao (497-554) in Tao-an's *KSC* biography. Now as Tao-an died in 385 (see T'ang's discussion of this point, *History*, I, 196), these dates do not agree with the above cited facts. The only explanation that I can suggest is that either Sun Ch'o's age is incorrectly given, or that he actually wrote eulogies for Wen and Wang a considerable time after their deaths. See Wilhelm, "A Note On Sun Ch'o . . . ," pp. 261, note 3, and 266, notes 33 and 34; for the quotation from the Tao-an eulogy, see A. Link, "Biography of Shih Tao-an," *TP*, XLIV (1958), 41-42.

Sun Ch'o even presses syncretism to the point where he is willing to declare that "Confucianism is Buddhism and Buddhism is Confucianism." (Wilhelm, "A Note On Sun Ch'o," p. 270). Wilhelm sees in this an attempted rationalization of two seeming irreconcilables. On the one hand, the gentry class (of which Sun Ch'o can be taken as an example) owed loyalty to the emperor and to the Confucian system which guaranteed their social and political status; on the other, they longed for a realization of the "independence and dignity of the individual *per se*." Wilhelm, "Note," p. 271).

Still it is arresting to note that these accommodations were not onesidedly made by the Chinese. Formerly it was generally thought that Buddhism became sinicized only gradually after its introduction in the first century of our era. Recently one of the foremost Japanese Buddhist scholars, Professor Hajime Nakamura, has clearly demonstrated that this was not so. For example, in the field of family ethics, we find that the following injunctions given in the *Singālovāda-suttana:*

"3. husband supports wife *sāmikena . . . bhariyā paccupatthātabbā*

As early as the time of Hui-yüan [17] (334-416), the great achievements in the study of Buddhist philosophy of the Chin Dynasty were made known and propagated extensively in south China. Buddhist scholars were already familiar with translations of the Abhidharma texts of Gautama-Saṅghadeva, of texts treating of *Dhyāna* by Buddhabhadra, and of the revolutionary theories of the *Śūnyavāda* [18] as expounded by Nāgārjuna and his disciples in the translations made by Kumārajīva and his followers. As we know from Seng-yu's writings and those of his contemporaries, great excitement was occasioned by studies undertaken on the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*—that great cosmogonic vision of the *Mahāyāna* which has so fired the imagination of the East—,[19] on the *Mahāparinirvāṇa*, that testimony of the Buddha's last ministry with its revolutionary Mahāyānistic ideals of a Buddha "eternal," "pure," and "joyous," [20] and on the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, whose

---

4. wife comforts husband *bhariyā . . . sāmikam anukampanti*
5. master supports servants *ayirakena . . . dāsakammakarā paccupatthatabbā*
6 servants comfort master *dasakammakāra . . . ayirakam anukampayanti*
(Cf. *Dīgha-nikāya*, III, 189 f.) "

were translated by such early foreign translators as An Shih-kao, Buddhayaśas, and Chu Fo-nien as:

"3. *Taisho* 16 vol. 1 p. 251b. 'The husband controls his wife.'
4. *Ibid.* (also 17 vol. 1 p. 254a). 'The wife serves her husband.'
Taisho 1 (16 vol. 1 p. 72a. 'The wife reveres her husband.'
5. *Taisho* 16 vol. 1 p. 251b. 'The master controls his servants.'
Ibid. 1 (16) vol. 1 p. 72a. 'The master instructs his servants.'
6. *Taisho* 16 vol. 1 p. 251c. 'The servants serve their master.'
Ibid. 17 vol. 1 p. 254b. 'The servants provide for their master.'
Ibid. 1 (16) vol. 1 p. 72a. 'The servants busy themselves for their master.' "

Nakamura concludes that current Confucian attitudes toward the sexes and toward the relationship between social classes (masters vs. servants) dictated these alterations in the texts. See his article "The Influence of Confucian Ethics On the Chinese Translations of Buddhist Sutras," *Sino-Indian Studies Liebenthal Festschrift*, pp. 165-166.

[17] On Hui-yüan, see especially Walter Liebenthal, "Shih Hui-yüan's Buddhism as set forth in his Writings," *JAOS*, LXX (1950), 243-259, and Leon Hurvitz, "Render Unto Caesar in Early Chinese Buddhism," *Sino-Indian Studies Liebenthal Festschrift*, pp. 80-114. Also see the recent study on Hui-yüan by E. Zürcher in the latter's *The Buddhist Conquest of China* (Leiden, 1959), pp. 204-253. This includes an annotated translation of Hui-yüan's *KSC* biography.

[18] For a recent especially perceptive discussion of *Mādhyamika* theories see Richard H. Robinson, "Some Logical Aspects of Nāgārjuna's System," *Philosophy East and West*, VI (Honolulu, 1957), 291-308.

[19] Seng-yu incidentally alludes to the famous parable of the burning house in *T.* 50. *CST.* 12. 88a: "Now when the three worlds (*trilokadhātu*) are established in their positions, and the six ways (*gati*) are distinguished and classified, the coarse and the subtle are [perceived as] different in their appearance, and pain and joy to be unlike in their traces. If one contemplates their source and beginning, these are not separated from matter (*rūpa*) and mind (*citta*). If one examines their combined point of reversion, none does not come to be born and to be extinguished [in the common lot of *saṃsāra*]. As regards the turning of the wheel of birth and death, this we call impermanence (*anitya*). Matter (*rūpa*) and mind (*citta*) are like shadow apparitions, and this we speak of as the origin (*samudaya*) of suffering (*duḥkha*). Therefore, the *Nirvāṇasūtra* likens this to a great river; the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* compares it to a burning house. The Sage (i. e., Buddha) with his transcendent Enlightenment pacifies [beings striving in their various modes of salvation like children] with carts, and makes them return to the source, and draws out these three [careers of the] beings [from the general conflagration] so that afterwards they can achieve Enlightenment (*wei-tao=bodhi*)." In this beautiful parable, as is well known, the Buddha is likened to a father who, returning home, sees that his house is on fire. Calling to his children playing in the blazing structure, and finding that they pay him no heed, he hits upon the good expedient (*upāya*) of tempting them to safety by displaying three little carts drawn by a goat, a deer, and an ox. The children thereupon rush out and are saved. The three carts (*yāna*, "careers") are, of course, the *Śrāvaka*, *Pratyekabuddha*, and *Bodhisattva* careers. In reality, as the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* explains, there is only one career (*ekayāna*), or vehicle of Enlightenment, the *Buddhayāna*.

[20] The radical transformation from a negative to a positive outlook which these interpretations provided the Chinese with, and which hastened the syncretic Sino-Buddhist *Zeitgeist* of Seng-yu's day, can hardly be overly stressed. In place of the early absolutely basic doctrines of "impermanence" (*wu-ch'ang, anitya*), "suffering" (*k'u, duḥkha*), "impersonality" (*wu-wo, anātman*), and "impurity" (*pu-ching, aśuddha*) the *Nirvāṇasūtra* boldly proclaimed the ideal of a transcendent state that was "eternal" (*ch'ang, nitya*), "blissful" or "joyous" (*lo, sukha*), "*personal*" (*wo, ātman*), and "pure" (*ching, śuddha*). Both the influencial Hua-yen sect of north China and the important T'ien-t'ai sect of south China conceived of Buddhism in positive terms. Zenryū Tsukamoto puts the difference in *Weltanschauung* which these views implied very succinctly: "The Buddhists of China," he states, "laid

protagonist Vimalakīrti was the very model of the aristocratic *chün-tzu* ("gentleman") so beloved by the Confucians, here revealed in new dignity and added prestige as the universal savior, the *Bodhisattva* ideal of the Mahāyāna.[21]

Favored by the aristocracy, encouraged by imperial backing, of which the most extraordinary example is afforded by Emperor Wu of the Liang,[22] many intellectually gifted monks found in the time-honored lore and traditionally elaborate systematizations of a sinicized Buddhism cultural and scholarly satisfactions which their ancestors had formerly discovered in Confucianism or Taoism. In this kind of thought we find that the *Tao* is equated with Enlightenment (*Bodhi*);[23] the concept of *Li* ("Cosmic Order")[24] of the *Canon of Changes* is construed to mean the transcendental absolute principle of reality as contrasted to the relative realm of sensory data; the counterpart to that order in the social realm, "good form," (*Li*) is matched with the monastic rules governing the life of the Buddhist clergy, the *Vinaya*.[25] The concept of the soul, of its ultimate destiny, and of the stages thereto, drawing much from both the Confucian and Taoist traditions, becomes the subject of fierce controversy in protracted debates between materialists and non-materialists, between advocates of a "gradualism," grounded on the basis of an erudite understanding and mastery of scholarly minutiate, and of a "subitism," with its bold declaration of "full awareness or nothing at all!"[26]

Chinese Buddhism, which slowly had seeped along the arteries of Serindian trade routes, commencing from about the first century or our era, had in the fourth century A.D. entered the main blood stream of Chinese philosophical thought. This metaphysical transfusion had stimulated, revivified, and inadverently created potent antibodies of resistance in its host; but nevertheless, by Seng-yu's day it is as integral a part of the Chinese body cultural as were the earlier Taoism and Confucianism. The records of these great events in Buddhist history needed to be collected and studied. Seng-yu set himself to that task. He is the first historian and bibliographer of Chinese Buddhism whose works have survived.

The Kao-seng chuan *Biography of Shih Seng-yu*

Seng-yu is remembered today as a bibliophile and a bibliographer. Undoubtedly this would have surprised him. He considered himself—and certainly his contemporaries so considered him—a specialist on the *Vinaya*, in particular, on that form of disciplinary code most popular in south China in his time, the *Sarvāstivāda Vinaya*. In this regard, Seng-yu truly reflects the scholasti-

special emphasis on the notion that the religious state at which they aimed must be a state of mind in which concrete reality is absolutely affirmed. *This is what makes Chinese Buddhism Chinese"* (my italics). See his article "Buddhism in China and Korea," as tr. by Leon Hurvitz, in K. Morgan (ed.), *The Path of the Buddha* (New York, 1956), p. 209. On this also see T'ang, *History*, II, 677-717. As T'ang remarks, enthusiasm for a Buddha conceived in these terms, which fitted so well with the age-old Chinese notions of the nature of a cosmic sage-ruler, led to a loss of interest in the earlier *Prajñā* theories of Tao-an's time (4th century). (*History*, II, 677).

[21] On the popularity of the *Vimalakīrti*, see note 129 of this paper.

[22] He was called, for example, "Emperor Bodhisattva," "Savior Bodhisattva," and "Bodhisattva Son of Heaven." Wright, *Buddhism in Chinese History*, p. 51; see also on this ruler, Mori Mikisaburō, *Ryō no Butei* ("Emperor Wu of the Liang") (Kyoto, 1956), especially pp. 134-169.

[23] Concerning this frequent rendering in the archaic texts, see Pelliot, *TP*, XIII (1912), 406. In other instances *Tao* does service for *mārga*, or *pāramitā*, as in *tao-te* (the "way and its power"), and *chih-tao* (the "ultimate way"). See on these, Paul Demiéville, "La *Yogācārabhūmi* de Saṅgharakṣa," *BEFEO*, XLIV (1954), 404, note 4, and 406, note 6.

[24] For the range and history of this term, see Walter Liebenthal, "The World Conception of Chu Tao-sheng," in *Monumenta Nipponica*, XII (Tokyo, Oct., 1956–Jan., 1957), 75-77, and Demiéville, "La Pénétration du Buddhisme dans la tradition philosophique chinoise," *Journal of World History*, III (1956), 28-31. Demiéville traces this form of dualism in particular to Chih Tun. It appears centuries later as one of the central conceptions of Neo-Confucianism.

[25] *T.* 50. *KSC.* 11. 405c-406b. Wright observes that Hui-chiao, the renowned author of the *KSC*, is even willing to go so far as to admit that the *Vinaya* was fundamental to monastic life, but that for regulating the life of the laity *li* ("good form") and *i* ("decorum") take precedence. See Wright, "Biography and Hagiography, Hui-chiao's *Lives of Eminent Monks*," in the *Silver Jubilee Volume of the Jimbun-kagaku-kenkyūjo* (Kyoto, 1954), p. 398.

[26] For a masterly discussion and analysis of the texts and problems concerned with these questions, see Demiéville, *Le concile de Lhasa: une controverse sur le quiétisme entre Bouddhistes de l'Inde et de la Chine au VIIIe siècle de l'ère chrétienne* (Paris, 1952).

cism of a medieval period. For Seng-yu the study of the innumerable divisions of the *Vinaya*, with their precisely formulated rules and sub-rules, was a sacred task; thus he states:[27]

> Whenever I unrolled the Holy Texts
> I concentrated my devout aspiration
> Whenever I gazed aloft to the Remote Path
> I soared aloft in Spirit . . .

Though we may sympathize with such religious enthusiasm, we can scarcely participate in it. As far as concerns this interest in the *Vinaya*, even those who are now Buddhists no longer share with Seng-yu a "common universe of discourse." The values which he respected in himself, and for which his generation admired him, are not those which recommend him to us today. It is due to one of Seng-yu's secondary activities, his bibliographic researches, that we remember him. Yet a man whose religious and lay disciples are said to have numbered eleven thousand persons, who enjoyed the esteem and confidence of princes and emperors, is—if only on historical grounds—worthy of study. In this sense, Seng-yu serves as almost a standard example of one type of the Buddhist *Saṅgha*, and a type by no means unimportant in the social and political history of China: the renowned, erudite, and sophisticated metropolitan cleric. It was this type who, to no small extent, contributed to the domestication of Buddhism in China.

It is unfortunate that we do not have a biography commensurate in its treatment of Seng-yu with his obvious importance in Buddhist history. The most detailed and yet one that is still unsatisfactory, is that given by Hui-chiao in the *Kao-seng chuan*. An annotated translation of this rather skimpy account follows.

TRANSLATION

Biography of Shih Seng-yu

(*T.* 50. *KSC.* 11. 402c)

Shih Seng-yu was by clan originally surnamed Yü. [Although] his ancestors had been people of Hsia-p'ei in P'eng-ch'eng,[28] his father had lived his life in Chien-yeh.[29]

When Yu was but several years of age he entered the Monastery Established First[30] (Chien-ch'u ssu). Having knelt with joined hands in worship (*namaḥ-kāra*), he found as a consequence that his heart skipped and leaped in delight in the Way [of religion], and he was unwilling to return home. His parents, taking pity on his resolution, for the time, allowed him to enter the Way [of the religious life], and as his teacher, to render service to the man of *Tao*, Seng-fan.[31]

When he became fourteen years old [however], his family secretly made inquiries to get him married. Yu on learning about this, fled. When he came to Ting-lin [Monastery],[32] he put himself at the disposal of the Master of the *Dharma*, Fa-ta.[33] Ta, also, because of the zealousness and strictness of his morality and virtue, was as a roof beam for the Gate of the *Dharma*. Yu, in serving his teacher, offered him the utmost sincerity.

When he came of age he [received] all the prohibitions [entailed by full ordination][34] (*upasampadā*) and maintained his integrity in strictness and clarity.

Previously he had received instructions from *Śramaṇa* Fa-ying.[35] Since Ying for the time had made a name

---

[27] *T.* 55. *CST.* 12. 89a.

[28] Hsia-p'ei was located about thirty miles ENE of P'eng-ch'eng. The latter corresponds to the modern T'ung-shan, *hsien* in Kiangsu. It was located about 125 miles NNW of the present Nanking. The P'eng-ch'eng area had long been noted for its Buddhism. For example, Liu I-min, famed as the scribe who wrote down the vow of Hui-yüan and his associates (at Lu-shan) to be reborn in the Western Paradise, was a native of this area. See Hui-yüan's biography (*T.* 50, *KSC.* 6. 358c).

[29] The Modern Nanking.

[30] The foundation of this monastery supposedly dated from its establishment under Sun Ch'üan to enshrine a sacred relic (*śarīra*) miraculously procured by K'ang Seng-hui in or about A. D. 247. Its name derives from the fact that it was claimed to be the first monastery established in the Wu capital (the modern Nanking). See *T.* 50. *CST.* 13. 96b. On these miraculous feats of K'ang Seng-hui, see also Lu Hsün's reconstruction of the Seng-hui legend in the *Ku hsiao-shuo kou-ch'en* (revised ed., Peking, 1951), pp. 366-368. Seng-hui's *KSC* biography has been translated by Chavannes. See *TP*, X (1909), 199-212.

[31] Seng-fan is otherwise unknown; the Shih Seng-fan mentioned in *HKSC* is obviously not this man.

[32] Located at Chung-shan, "Bell Mountain" in the modern Nanking. This temple was erected sometime during the *Yüan-chia* era (424-453) of the Liu Sung Dynasty. See T'ang, *History*, II, 417.

[33] Not much can be found out about Fa-ta. Apparently at one time he studied meditation under Shih Seng-shen (see the latter's biography *T.* 50. *KSC.* 11. 400a), and later became a "Regulator of the *Saṅgha*" (*Seng-cheng*) during the Wei Dynasty (see the biography of Hsüan-kao *T.* 50. *KSC.* 398a).

[34] [*Shou*]-*chü-chieh* = *upasampadā*.

[35] Shih Fa-ying, a native of Tun-huang, became a monk when he was thirteen. After having studied together with a certain Fa-li under a master by the name of Fa-hsiang, both disciples are said to have "made their names known for their knowledge of the *Vinaya-piṭaka*." Fa-ying must have possessed a remarkable memory for we are told that "he would not

for himself as a master exegete, he was held in high respect by students of the *Vinaya*. Yu thereupon labored to the end of his wits in trying to penetrate and search out [the doctrinal purport], working without flagging night and day.

In thus applying himself with great zeal to the division of the *Vinaya* [texts] he has excelled previous men of wisdom. Whenever Prince Wen Hsüan [36] of Ching-ling [37] of the Ch'i [Dynasty] invited him to lecture on the *Vinaya* the congregation of his auditors was commonly seven or eight hundred persons.

During the reign era of *Yung-ming* [38] ("Perpetual Illumination") he received an imperial command to enter Wu [39] to examine and make selections among the five groups [40] [of the religious], and at the same time to elucidate and lecture on the *Shih-sung* [41] (*Sarvāstivāda-Vinaya*), as well as to set forth the methods for receiving the prohibitions (*śīlasamādāna*). Whatever alms were given by the faithful [at these meetings] he used entirely for the bettering of Ting-lin and Chien-ch'u, and for the repairing of[other] monasteries. Moreover, he instituted the Quinquennial Great Festival-gathering [of the Buddhist Order] [42] (*Pañcavarṣika-mahā-pariṣā*), the renunciation of the person [43] (**adhyātma-tyāga*),

---

ask for something to be repeated as he remembered it on one hearing." He became a specialist on the *Vinaya* and also became rather broadly acquainted with the *Sūtra* and *Śāstra*. It is likely that Seng-yu studied under Fa-ying after the latter became a noted metropolitan cleric. That Fa-ying achieved high distinction at the capital is known from his biography: "In the latter years of *Yüan-chia* (reign-era of Wen-ti of the Sung; reigned 424-453) he went down [south] to the capital and resided in the "New Pavilion Monastery" (Hsin-t'ing ssu). When Hsiao-wu-ti (reigned 454-463) came south, he rebuilt this monastery, and because Ying's learning and accomplishments were equally brilliant, by imperial order [Fa-ying] was made Regulator of the *Saṅgha* (*Seng-cheng*) for the capital and its environs." He later gave up this position (for what reasons we are not told). However, when Emperor Kao, founder of the Southern Ch'i, came to the throne in 479, he was once more made by imperial order Master of the *Saṅgha* (*Seng-chu*). He died in 482 at the age of sixty-seven (*sui*) leaving behind him several works, notably an opus on the *Sarvāstivāda Vinaya*. The above is drawn from his biography *T.* 50. *KSC.* 11. 402a.

[36] The Prince of Ching-ling (406-494), later canonized as Wen-hsüan (courtesy name, Liang), was the second son of Emperor Wu of the Southern Ch'i (reigned 483-493). He was made Director of Instruction (*Ssu-t'u*), and Grand Master (*T'ai-fu*). Noted for his Buddhist piety and for his love of learning, he contributed much to the spread of the Buddhist religion by his largess and patronage. For example, he had the five classics and the "hundred authors" copied or extracts made from them as the *Ssu-pu yao-lüeh* in 1000 *chüan*. (T'ang, *History*, II, 473). Extracts made from Buddhist writings counted 36 works (*pu*) (*T.* 55. *CST.* 5. 38a) numbering 122 *chüan*. [The *Shih-chiao lu* adds seven more works to Seng-yu's list, making 43 in all, amounting to 298 *chüan* (see *T.* 55. 679b-680a)]. Moreover, the Prince of Ching-ling had Seng-yu compile a *Dharma Collection* (*Fa-chi*) in sixteen portfolios and 116 *chüan* (*T.* 55. *CST.* 12. 86a). Seng-yu also compiled another *Dharma Collection* for the Prince of Pa-ling, Ching-ling's son, in ten works (*pu*); see *T.* 55. *CST.* 12, 86c. Most interesting among these literary activities which Prince Wen-hsüan sponsored was the writing of a general history of Buddhism in some ten *chüan* usually called the *San-pao chi*, which, as the title indicates, gave an account of the *Buddha*, *Dharma*, and *Saṅgha*. Notwithstanding the literary productivity of this great *Dānapati*, his works (or works compiled at his request), were not considered as of any great literary value and as a consequence even by Sui times only seventeen of his writings had survived (see *Li-tai san-pao chi*, 11. 96c; *Nan-ch'i-shu*, 40, and note 74 of this paper).

[37] In present Chung-hsiang *hsien* in Hupei.

[38] 483-493 A. D.

[39] Probably the modern Wu *hsien* area in Kiangsu.

[40] Wu-chung, *Bhikṣu*, *Bhikṣuṇī*, *Śramaṇera*, *Śramaṇerikā*, *Śikṣamāṇa*.

[41] On the enormous influence of the Sarvāstivādin Kashmirian tradition on early Chinese Buddhism, see Demiéville, "La *Yogācārabhūmi* de Saṅgharakṣa," *BEFEO*, XLIV (Paris, 1954), especially 340-341; see also note 76 of this paper.

[42] *Wu-che-ta-hui*, literally, "the great gathering of unconcealing." The *Pañcavarṣika-pariṣā* was the great festival gathering of the Buddhist Order held every five years, at which we are told, "worthies and sages, religious and laity, the noble and the humble, superiors and inferiors, without concealing (*wu-che*) equally circulated valuables . . ." (*FHTTT*, 2191c). The custom of such a convocation of the Buddhist Order goes back to the time of Aśoka. This great Indian *Cakravartī*—the "Constantine of Buddhism"—convened such a meeting for the general confession and repentence of sins, the inculcation of morality and discipline and the distribution of charity.

It is possible that Seng-yu learned about this venerable practice from certain pilgrims who had gone to Khotan. In his *Record of the Sūtra of the Wise and the Fool* (*Hsien-yü-ching chi*) we read that some eight monks, "having resolved to make a pilgrimage afar to search out the *sūtra-piṭaka*, in Khotan (Yü-t'ien) at the Great Monastery (*Mahāvihāra*) happened upon the assembly of the *Pañcavarṣika* (*pan-che-yü-se*)." At this point Seng-yu introduces the following gloss: "*Pan-che-yü-se* in Chinese means the quinquennial entire great assembly (*wu-nien i-ch'ieh ta-chung hui*). [At this assembly] they teach by preaching and elucidating the *Vinaya* according to duties (? *i-yeh*) . . ." (*T.* 55. *CST.* 9. 67c). On the *Pañcavarṣika-pariṣā* see also the brief note in Edgerton, *BHS*, p. 315.

[43] *She-shen*, **adhyātma-tyāga*. Out of a desire to emulate the sacrifices of the *Bodhisattva*, and to render thanks to the Buddha for his infinite compassion, some of the more fanatic Buddhists, particularly during the period of the Six Dynasties, immolated themselves, or offered themselves up as slaves. Both the *Hinayāna* and the *Mahāyāna* considered the advantages accruing from

and the holding of maigre feasts for the religious;[44] and also he built up a collection of the scriptures[45] (*sūtrapiṭaka*), and examined and collated its rolls and scrolls. If now monasteries and temples are extensively opened and the words of the *Dharma* are not dropped by the wayside, this is wholly due to his efforts.

Yu was by nature gifted with ingenious ideas, and he was able to estimate measurement by sight and to calculate by heart. Moreover, when craftsmen would rely on a standard [of measurement], to the foot and to the inch, there would be no missing of the mark! Thus, as regards such great images as those of Kuang-chai[46] and of Mount She,[47] and the stone Buddha(s) of Shan Prefecture,[48] [the persons in charge] all invited Yu to organize and inaugurate [the work] and to measure and draw up the plans.

The One On High at present[49] treated him with deep

---

the more extravagant forms of such sacrifice as highly questionable; the *Hīnayāna* even went so far as to say that self-immolation was contrary to the *Vinaya*. On the other hand, examples were not far to seek of spectacular self-sacrifices and justifications for these in such *Sūtra* as the *Fan-wang ching*, *Brahmajālasūtra*, *T.* no. 1484 [on the questionable authenticity of parts of this scripture, see James R. Ware, "Notes On the *Fan Wang Ching*," *HJAS*, I (1936), 156-161], and in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* [Cf. the ch. on *Bhaiṣajya-rāja Boddhisattva's* vows and the sacrifice of his arms; the ch. treating of this immolation is mentioned in the story of the monk who burns himself alive in *T.* 50. *KSC.* 12. 404c], and in the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa* (*Chin-kuang-ming ching T.* no. 663), which has a ch. called "Renunciation of the Person" (*She-shen p'in*, **adyātma-tyāga-parivarta*). [It relates how the *Mahāsattva*, as the third son of an Indian *Mahārāja*, sacrificed himself to feed a starving tigress. This *parivarta* also, incidentally, is mentioned in another instance of self-immolation, *T.* 50. *KSC.* 12. 404c]. Though both Liang Wu-ti and Ch'en Wu-ti frequently "renounced their persons" (*She-shen*) by entering monasteries as "slaves" (from which servitude their ministers had to bail them out by paying exorbitant sums to the *vihāra* concerned), the relatively low scale of value placed on these practices is clearly shown by Seng-yu and Hui-chiao. Thus, Seng-yu in his "Lives of the Monks" (on these see under "General Remarks on the *CST*" in this paper) includes no biographies of the *She-shen* category (there are, to be sure, a few colorful accounts in which examples of personal renunciation are mentioned, but these are incidental to the biographies as a whole). And Hui-chiao's obvious distaste for such "barbarian practices" is proved by two points:

(1) He reduced the number of biographies in this category from the nineteen in his principal source to only eleven (compare this with 257 major biographies in his *KSC* mainly in the categories of translators and exegetes);

(2) The space devoted to these eleven men occupies approximately two pages in the *Taishō* ed. of the Chinese *Tripiṭaka* (exclusive of the *lun*, the "critical discussion") compared with approximately ninety-three pages (including *lun*) of the *KSC* devoted to other categories. Moreover, Hui-chiao discusses at length the propriety of self-immolation in the "critical discussion" of this section in a most apologetic tone. It is obvious that Hui-chiao, the pious Buddhist, and Hui-chiao, the traditionalist Chinese, are in conflict over two different value systems: the preservation of one's body out of reverence for the gift of life made possible by one's parents (cf., e. g., the teaching of filial piety in the *Hsiao-ching* on this point), and the sacrifice of one's life for the greater good of others (the *Bodhisattva's* vow). In the writings of Sun Ch'o we seen an attempted rationalization of this dilemma: the spiritual state at which the *Śramaṇa* aims is a bliss which will redound to the welfare of his parents. Far from contradicting the principle of filial piety, it enhances it. All merely temporal expressions of filial piety can, therefore, be dispensed with. See on this point, Wilhelm, "A Note On Sun Ch'o," pp. 270-271.

[44] *Chai*, this may refer to the *upoṣadha* ceremony, for which see Edgerton, *BHS*, p. 147. On the other hand, it is possible that both *She-shen* and *chai* should be taken together: "maigre feasts at which there was renuciation of one's person."

[45] *T.* 55. *CST.* 12. 92c notes that this collection was made by the Prince of Lin-ch'uan (on this person, see below note 54); however, according to Liu Hsieh's biography in *Liang-shu*, it really was made by Liu. It is likely that both Seng-yu and Liu Hsieh did the actual compilation of this famous *Tripiṭaka* and that, as it was accomplished under the patronage of the Prince of Lin-ch'uan, it was ostensibily ascribed to the latter.

[46] Located in Chiang-ning *fu*. In the first year of *T'ien-chien* of the Liang (502) [another source says 3rd year], Emperor Wu turned his old residence over to the Buddhist Order to be used as a *vihāra*. Since at this time—so we are told—an image of Kuan-yin (*Avalokiteśvara*) emitted a radiant aura (*raśmi-prabhāsa*) for seven days, the new monastery was called Kuang-chai, "Radiant Residence." Monk Fa-yün by imperial order was made its first abbot. On this temple, see *BD*, 1070c.

[47] She-shan, located in Kiangsu, NE of the modern Chiang-ning *hsien*, supposedly owed its name to the presence there of medicinal herbs which were plucked (*she*) as an aid to life. It was a great center for the practice of Buddhist meditation (*Dhyāna*), and became intimately connected with the development of T'ien-t'ai. On its T'ien-t'ai associations, see T'ang, *History*, II, 795.

[48] Shan Prefecture (*hsieh*) was located in the Shao-hsing area of Chekiang. It was noted for its Buddhist monasteries and beautiful temples, and it was there, according to one theory, that the noted *Ch'ing-t'an* adept, Chih Tun, died. See *T.* 50. *KSC.* 4. 349c, and the *Shan-lu* by Kao Ssu-sun (Sung Dynasty), 3b-12b (*Shao-wu hsü-shih ts'ung-shu* ed.). Hsi Ch'ao (336-377), *Tzu*, Ching-hsing, wrote an account of the more famous Buddhist recluses on these mountains, the *Tung-shan seng-chuan*, *Lives of the Monks of the Eastern Mountains*. On this work, see Wright, "Lives," p. 422.

[49] Liang Wu-ti, during whose reign Hui-chiao wrote his *KSC*. The following mention of an "examination"

respect and cordiality. The monks of common attainments greatly suspected him in these affairs [as seeking his own aggrandizement] and had him come that they might examine and decide the matter.

In his declining years he had a disease of the feet. By an imperial command he was permitted to ride a palanquin in entering the inner hall [of the imperial court] for the sake of administering the reception of the prohibitions (*śīlasamādāna*) [to the ladies] of the Six Palaces.[50] The honors bestowed on him were of this sort.

Chih-tsang[51] of the K'ai-shan [Monastery],[52] and Hui-k'uo of the Fa-yin [Monastery][53] both held his virtue in high respect, and regularly begged that they might serve him with the decorum due a teacher.

Under the Liang, Prince Hung of Lin-ch'uan,[54] Prince Wei of Nan-p'ing,[55] Yüan Ang of Ch'en Commandery[56] [bearing the title of] Rights Equal [to those of the Three Dukes],[57] the princess [posthumously entitled] Tîng of Yung-k'ang, and the Precious Concubine, neé Tîng,[58] all held the exemplary quality of his morality in the highest regard, and demonstrated to the uttermost extent their reverence for him as a master teacher.[59] All told, of his followers both of the laity and of the cloth[60] there were more than eleven thousand persons.

In the seventeenth year of *T'ien-chien*, on the sixteenth day of the fifth moon,[61] he died in the Chien-ch'u Monastery; he had seen seventy-and-four springs and autumns. Subsequently his coffin was entombed to the west of K'ai-shan Way, which was the ancient tumulus of Ting-lin. His disciple, Cheng-tu,[62] erected a stone memorial tablet which eulogized his virtues, and Liu Hsieh[63] wrote an inscription.

Previously Yu had collected together the *sūtra-piṭaka*, and when this was accomplished, he had others copy out and compile the important topics as the *San-tsang chi* (*Records of the Tripiṭaka*), the *Fa-yüan chi* (*Records of the Garden of the Dharma*), the *Shih-chieh chi* (*Records of the Worlds*), the *Shih-chia p'u* (*Chronological Biography of Śākya*), and the *Hung-ming chi* (*Collection Aggrandizing and Clarifying* [*Buddhism*]),[64] all of which are circulating in the world.

Seng-yu's Writings

As can be seen from his biography, Seng-yu was a prolific author and his writings well reflect both the extent and the depth of his Buddhist and secular erudition. Much of Seng-yu's efforts as a scholar were absorbed in the collecting, studying, and classifying of the scattered translations of the Buddhist scriptures, of bibliographical and biographical notices connected with these, as well as of exegetical and apologetical essays composed by native Chinese Buddhists.[65] These works he brought together to form massive collections of the

---

of Seng-yu's motives in his relations with the imperial family is most intriguing. But what happened? Presumably Seng-yu was cleared. This is one of those instances where Chinese biographical style is so frustrating to the Western scholar.

[50] A circumlocution meaning the imperial harem.

[51] Chih-tsang, a native of Wu Commandery (Wu-*chün*, Kiangsu, Wu *hsien* area of today), died at the age of sixty-five. He was a noted metropolitan preacher and lectured and wrote many commentaries on the *Nirvāṇa-sūtra*, the *Prajñāpāramitā*, *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, *Daśa-bhūmika*, and *Suvarṇaprabhāsa Sūtra*, and on the *Satya-siddhi*, *Śatakaśāstra*, and *Abhidharmahṛdaya Śāstra*. See his biography in *T.* 50. *HKSC.* 5. 465c-467b and *BD*, 3592a.

[52] The K'ai-shan Monastery was located about 10 *li* beyond the Ch'ao-yang Gate of the modern Nanking. See *BD*, 389a.

[53] I have been unable to find any information on Hui-k'uo of the Fa-yin Monastery.

[54] On Hung, Prince of Lin-ch'uan, see *Liang-shu*, 22, and *Nan-shih*, 51. Lin-ch'uan was situated west of the present *hsien* of the same name in Kiangsi.

[55] On Wei, Prince of Nan-p'ing, see *Liang-shu*, 21, and *Nan-shih*, 52. He was, prior to 518, called the Prince of Chien-an. In 518, however, he renounced his former title to assume that of Prince of Nan-p'ing. He achieved renown among the Buddhists of south China as a noble *Dānapati*, and continued to further Buddhist interests until his death in 533.

[56] On Yüan Ang, see *Liang-shu*, 31 and *Nan-shih*, 26. Ch'en Commandery was located NE of the present Hsiang-ch'eng *hsien* in Honan.

[57] *I-t'ung*, an abbreviation of the title *i-t'ung-san-ssu*. This title, established during the Han Dynasty, lasted until the Ming, at which time it was abolished. See *DKWJT*, 1172. 85.

[58] The *Ryō kōsōden sakuin* ("Index to the *Liang Kao-seng chuan*" jointly compiled by Tsukamoto Zenryū, Iwai Tairyō, and Ryūchi Kiyoshi [which appeared serially in *Shina Bukkyō shigaku*, 1, no. 1 (1937) to vol. 3, no. 1 (1939)] has erroneously listed Princess Tîng of Yung-k'ang and the Precious Concubine, née Tîng together as one person. Princess Tîng's personal name was Yü-hsüan; Tîng was her posthumous name. The Precious Concubine was in charge of the palace women; her position was next to that of the empress. The Lady Tîng was the *Kuei-p'in* of Emperor Wu (Kao-tzu) of the Liang. On these persons, see *Liang-shu*, 7 (*K'ai-ming* ed., 1779b-c).

[59] *Shih-tzu*; on this term see *DKWJT*, 8916. 86.

[60] Literally, *pai-hei*, "white and black" = the "lightly and darkly clad," i. e., lay people and religious.

[61] May 26, A. D. 518.

[62] Otherwise unknown.

[63] Liu Hsieh, author of the famous work on literary criticism, the *Wen-hsin tiao-lung*.

[64] These works are discussed briefly under Seng-yu's writings in the present paper.

[65] In a previous article I have pointed out the importance of such writings as a source for the correct evaluation of Chinese attitudes toward Buddhism. See "Shyh Daw-an's Preface to Saṅgharakṣa's *Yogācāra-bhūmi-sūtra* and the Problem of Buddho-Taoist Termi-

Chinese *Tripiṭaka*; they were stored apparently in libraries especially constructed to house them at the Ting-lin and Chien-ch'u Monasteries, the two monasteries at the capital with which he was especially associated.[66] In this regard it is interesting to note that Hui-chiao (497-554), the renowned author of the *Kao-seng chuan*, and a person who seems not to have been overly impressed by the great metropolitan clerics who were his senior contemporaries at the capital,[67] did not regard Seng-yu as truly the "author" of several of these works. He considered him as merely an authority at whose behest "others copied out and compiled the important affairs [of the *Tripiṭaka*]."[68] Although we cannot know what the basis of this personal bias was, it may well have been, as Wright points out, simply an attitude conditioned by the envy and resentment of the provincial for the great urbane clerics of the capital.[69] Doubtlessly he looked upon these men as opportunists and sycophants. At any rate, Hui-chiao was not above availing himself of Seng-yu's collection of biographies appended to the *Collection of Records On the Translated Tripitaka*,[70] nor of the biographical work of Seng-yu's disciple, Pao-ch'ang, the *Ming-seng chuan* (*Lives of Famous Monks*).[71] Still, it must be admitted that most of Seng-yu's literary production was of the nature of compilation rather than of "creation." In this he is simply following the time-honored Chinese scholastic tradition of *shu erh pu-tso*, "transmitting, not creating."[72]

It is unfortunate that his bibliographical investigations were limited in the main to his own time and place, and that he was unable to extend them to the Northern Wei. This, as Hayashiya Tomojirō implies, was not due to any inadequacy or narrowness of vision on Seng-yu's part, but was imposed by the nature of the times.[73]

As far as we are able to know Seng-yu wrote eight major works. These are:

1. The *Shih-chia p'u* (*Chronological Biography of Śākya*) in five *chüan* (*T.* 50. 1a-84b). This is an extremely valuable account giving the genealogy of the *Śākya* clan, biographies of Śākyamuni, his parents and relatives, disciples, and others, drawn from various *Hīnayāna* and *Mahāyāna Sūtra* and *Vinaya* works.[74]

---

nology in Early Chinese Buddhism," *JAOS*, LXXVII (1957), especially 2-3.

[66] See his biography and note 45 of this paper; also Hayashiya Tomojirō, *Kokuyaku*, p. 3. In what follows I have drawn heavily upon Hayashiya's introductory remarks to his Japanese translation of the *CST*, the *Shutsusanzōkishū*.

[67] See Wright, "Biography and Hagiography, Hui-chiao's *Lives of Eminent Monks*," *Silver Jubilee Volume of the Jinbun-kagaku-Kenkyūjo* (1954), pp. 393-394. This attitude resulted, as Tao-hsüan points out in his *Continuation to the Lives of the Eminent Monks* (*HKSC*) *preface* (435a), and as Wright notes, in very inferior coverage of the great metropolitan monks of the Liang Dynasty.

[68] Seng-yu's biography.

[69] Wright, "Lives," p. 394.

[70] The *CST* in its biographical section contains 32 major biographies and all of these were taken over (with some modifications) by Hui-chiao. I have previously noted the type of modifications introduced in one of the more important of these biographies in my "Remarks On Shih Seng-yu's *Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi* as a Source for Hui-chiao's *Kao-seng chuan* as Evidenced in Two Versions of the Biography of Tao-an," *Oriens*, X (1957), 292-296. Moreover, for information on translators Hui-chiao heavily relied on certain *CST* prefaces. For examples, see Wright, "Lives," p. 428, note 4.

[71] On Hui-chiao's use of this work, see Wright, "Lives," especially "The Problem of the *Ming-seng chuan*," pp. 408-412.

[72] Seng-yu, in fact, quotes this famous cliché in his preface to the *Shih-chia p'u*: "Now in having copied out excerpts from the collected scriptures I am 'transmitting, not creating.'" (*T.* 55. *CST.* 12. 87c. 7-8). The *loc. class.* is, of course, *Lun-yü*, 11. Incidentally, Hui-chiao in his *KSC* preface also says that his work is *shu-erh wu-tso*, a variant of this same famous phrase (*T.* 50. *KSC.* 14. 419a. 19).

[73] Hayashiya, *Kokuyaku*, p. 3.

[74] In his preface to the *Shih-chia p'u* Seng-yu remarks that he not only comprehensively investigated the various scriptures and made notes from them, but added old traditions, secular records, and so forth, in order to make the words of the scriptures and such secular traditions supplement each other and "ancient hearsay and present vestiges to be mutually verified." (*T.* 50. *Shih-chia-p'u.* 1. 1a). There were several other writings during this period of the type of the *Shih-chia-p'u*. For example, during the Liang Dynasty three literati were ordered to compile a *Fa-chi* (*Record of the Dharma*) in thirty sections (*p'ien*). This purported to give an account of the holy vestiges of the *Tathāgata* and the "evoked responses" (*kan-ying*) of the Buddhist religion. A preface to this collection by Ch'en Yüeh fortunately has been preserved in the *Kuang hung-ming chi* (See T'ang, *History*, II, 574). Also the Prince of Ching-ling (canonized as Wen-hsüan; see above note 36) had a *San-pao chi* copied in ten *chüan*, the first section of which gave a "history of the Buddha(s)"; (the other two sections were: "Account of the *Dharma*," and "Record of the *Saṅgha*"). This work is listed in both the *Li-tai san-pao chi* and the *Ta t'ang nei-tien lu*. Hui-

2. The *Shih-chieh chi* or *Records of the Worlds* in five *chüan*. This was a collection of extracts from various canonical works which purported to give an explanation of the numerous world systems of Buddhist cosmology.[75]

3. The *Sa-p'o-to-pu chi* or *Records of the Sarvāstivāda School* in five *chüan*. This was an extremely important work which gave an account of more than ninety of the great figures connected with the School of the *Sarvāstivāda*, including not only the Indian or Serindian teachers, but also the translators, and the Chinese masters of the *Sarvāstivāda Vinaya* as well. Unfortunately, nothing has survived of this capital work but a table of contents, and mention of it in two later bibliographies.[76]

4. The *Fa-yüan tsa-yüan yüan-shih chi* or *The Garden of the Dharma: An Original Collection of Buddhist Historical Data*. This seems to have consisted of extracts which gave a history of the "Three Jewels" (*Triratna*), the *Buddha*, *Dharma*, and *Saṅgha*, and also described the rise and development of Buddhism in China.[77]

---

chiao may have used it as a source for his *KSC*—he criticizes it as ". . . confused and difficult to draw upon . . . ," but as nothing has survived, it is impossible to say to what extent he relied upon it. See T'ang, *History*, II, 578, and Wright, "Lives," p. 420.

[75] Judging from Seng-yu's preface to the *Shih-chieh chi* and the notices immediately following this preface in the *CST*, Seng-yu made extracts chiefly from the *Ta lü-t'an ching*, *T.* no. 23 (an extract from the *Dīrghāgama*), and from the *Ta fang-teng ta-chi ching*, the *Mahāvaipulya-mahāsannipātasūtra*, *T.* no. 397. Thus, he says in his *Shih-chieh chi* preface: "I humbly observe that the *Fang-teng ta-tien* (i.e., the *Ta-fang-teng ta-chi ching*, *Mahāvaipulya-mahāsannipātasūtra*), for the greater part, speaks of profound voidness (*śūnyatā*). Only the [*Ta*] *lü-t'an* [*ching*] discusses in a clear manner the worlds . . . Therefore, having collected and copied out these two *Sūtra* so as to form a basic text, and at the same time, having appended miscellaneous works and mutually set forth their similarities and differences, I have compiled these as [a text] in five *chüan*, and called it the *Shih-chieh chi-chi* (*T.* 55. *CST.* 12. 88b)." Some idea of the contents of this work (which gives seemingly the standard formulae of the *Abhidharma*) may be had from a short quotation elsewhere in this same preface (*T.* 55. *CST.* 12. 88a): "If we seek for the establishment of the physical basis of the world, it [*T.* 55. *CST.* 12. 88b] is accomplished by the four great [elements] (*mahābhūta*). When under the conditions of the combination (*ho *āya*) of deeds (*karma*) and causal factors (*yüan, pratyaya* ?) with time [these four elements] bring about the arising (**samudaya*) [of the apparent world process]. When their alloted time has been fulfilled, destruction (**vyaya*) commences, and they once again revert to extinction. This is what is meant by saying that those of short lives speak of its (i.e., the universe) length, and those whose lives are long, behold its shortness. Now emptiness and voidness are non-existent; therefore, their measure is illimitable; the worlds are inexhaustable; therefore, their appearance is not uniform . . ."

[76] T'ang, *History*, II, 824-827, has pointed out the importance of the study of the *Sarvāstivāda Vinaya* in the south since its translation by Kumārajīva and its propagation by, among others Seng-yeh, and Seng-kuan in Chien-yeh. During the Liu Sung, Ch'i, and Liang it constituted almost the only *Vinaya* practiced and studied in the south. T'ang's opinion is further substantiated by Seng-yu, who also stresses this in his preface to the catalogue of his *Records of the Sarvāstivāda School*. At first, he says, there was a common tradition in the *Vinaya*, but in the middle periods each school had its own tradition and students followed the particular teaching of their masters in the Five Schools (*Wu-pu*) of the *Vinaya*. However, "only the *Sarvāstivāda* School (for *p'ien* read with the Sung ed., *pien*) was practiced in the Ch'i land. Now originating in India [the stream of the holy doctrine] flowed on effecting the conversion of Kashmir (Chi-pin). (On this equivalence, which appears to have been regularly used to designate Kashmir from the 2nd to the 6th century, see especially L. Petech, *Northern India according to the Shui-ching-chu* (Rome, 1950), pp. 63-80. A résumé of the history of Kashmir has been given by N. Dutt in *Gilgit Manuscripts*, I (Srinagar, 1939), 3-45). Former sages and later worthies doubled its brilliance, and brought it repeated luster. Whether by virtue they mounted up to the stage of abiding (i.e., became a *sthavira*; see *BD*, 2612b), or as regards the *Tao* (**mārga*), verified it in the attainment of the four fruits (i.e., *srota-āpanna*, *Sakṛdāgāmin*, *Anāgāmin*, *Arhat*) . . . or vanished beyond sight (i.e., attained *Nirvāṇa*) . . . in every case, they grasped and maintained the *Vinaya* regulations, and opened up and raised aloft the conversion to the religion."

As Seng-yu's work is listed in both the *Li-tai san-pao chi* and the *Ta-t'ang nei-tien lu*, as well as in the Sui and T'ang monographs on literature, it may have survived at least to the T'ang period. Concerning this work, see Pelliot, *TP*, XIX (1918), 269, and T'ang, *History*, II, 578.

[77] For the preface to this work, see *T.* 55. *CST.* 12. 90b. Perhaps a note should be added here on the term *yüan* as occurring in this title, and later, in the title of the first chapter of the *CST*. The basic meaning of *yüan* in a Buddhist sense seems to be "contributing causal factors or conditions" (*pratyaya*). In this sense the word is contrasted to *yin* (*hetu*), "fundamental or direct cause." For example, the seed is the direct cause of the production of a tree; soil, sunshine, fertile or infertile soil, rain, and so on, the "contributing causal factors." In a more extended sense, *yüan* seems to mean, as here, the "history of such contributing factors as affects the Buddhist religion." The word also, of course. has many other meanings.

5. The *Hung-ming chi* or *Collection Aggrandizing and Clarifying [Buddhism]* in ten *chüan*. The *Hung-ming chi*, as its title indicates, is a collection of essays the chief aim of which was polemics.[78] Although Pelliot demonstrated long ago just how valuable this work is in regard to the points of controversy and the attempted reconciliations worked out by the Chinese Buddhists with regard to their Confucian or Taoist opponents' charges,[79] little attention or use has been made of this work until recently.[80] It is strange that this should be so, for the *Hung-ming chi* remains today probably our richest source for ideological debate during the period of disunity in China. Indeed, Seng-yu's valuable postface to this collection reads like a partial inventory of the issues being debated:[81]

> The first of their (i.e., the Buddhists' opponents) doubts is that the doctrines of the sūtras are sweeping, wild, vast, and cannot be verified. The second is that when man dies, his soul perishes, so that there is no such thing as the three ages (of past, present, and future). The third is that no one has seen the genuine Buddha, and that the rule of the country derives from him no benefit. The fourth is that anciently there was no Buddhist teaching, and that it appeared only recently during the Han era. The fifth is that the teaching belongs to barbarian lands, and does not accord with our Chinese customs. The sixth is that the Buddhist doctrine was unimportant (in China) during the Han and Wei (dynasties), and became flourishing only with the Chin. Because of these six doubts, the mind of faith cannot be established.

6. The *Shih-sung i chi* or *Account of the Meaning of the Sarvāstavāda Vinaya*. This, as the title indicates and as the preface and table of contents show, consisted of annotations and explanations on the *Shih-sung lü* or *Sarvāstivāda Vinaya*, of which Seng-yu was a specialist, to which different opinions of other schools on special *Vinaya* points were appended.[82]

7. *Fa-chi tsa-chi-ming* or *Collected Miscellaneous Recorded Inscriptions of the Dharma*. This was a collection of various records taken from stone tablets and other inscriptions.[83]

8. The *Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi* or *Collection of Records on the Translated Tripiṭaka*, in fifteen *chüan*. This work will be discussed separately.

Among these eight major works only three have survived to our time. These are the *Shih-chia p'u*, the *Hung-ming chi*, and the *Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi*. Of these three, the last is by far the most important.

Hayashiya observes that these eight collections are the result of Seng-yu's bibliographical researches in that all possible data concerned with Buddhism which seemed of importance or pertinence to Seng-yu were collected into these eight works.[84] Moreover, the data which was collected after Seng-yu had already compiled these collections was simply added to the particular compilation to which it pertained. Paradoxically, none gives the date of completion although this was one of the principal concerns of Seng-yu in his compiling of the *Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi*.[85] On the basis

---

[78] For the preface to this, see *T.* 55. *CST.* 12.93a-b. Seng-yu called this work *Hung-ming chi* since, he says, "the Way (*Tao*) is aggrandized (*hung*) by men; the teaching is clarified (*ming*) by texts. One aggrandizes (i.e., propagates or diffuses) the Way and clarifies the teaching, hence, I speak of this as the *Hung-ming chi*."

[79] In his brilliant translation and study of the *Li-huo lun*, the "Meou-tseu, on les doutes levés," *TP*, XIX (1918).

[80] One notable exception may be mentioned. This is Stefan Balázs' translation and study of the noted anti-Buddhist, Fan Chen's (ca. 450–ca. 515), *Shen-mieh lun* [*Discussion on the Soul's Extinction*]. See his, "Der Philosoph Fan Dchen und sein Traktak gegen den Buddhismus," *Sinica*, VII (1932), 220-234. Recently several essays contained in the *Hung-ming chi* have been translated and studied by Walter Liebenthal and E. Zürcher. For these see Zürcher, *The Buddhist Conquest of China*, 13-17.

[81] Translation by Derk Bodde, *A History of Chinese Philosophy*, II (Princeton, 1953), 285.

[82] Preface and table of contents preserved in *T.* 55. *CST.* 13. 94a-c. The work was in 10 *chüan*. This preface, incidentally contains a panegyric on Seng-yu's master, Fa-ying, whose fame and teachings, we are told, "were exalted in the generations of the Ch'i and of the Sung." (*T.* 55. *CST.* 13. 94b).

[83] Table of contents and preface preserved in *T.* 55. *CST.* 13. 94c. This collection consisted of seven *chüan*; among the inscriptions listed there are three by Liu Hsieh, and one by Ch'en Yüeh. T'ang, *History*, II, 588, notes that a *Chu-ssu pei-wen* [*Inscriptions of Various Monasteries*] in 46 *chüan* is recorded in the *Sui-chih*, and that a *Chung-seng hsing-chuang* [*Life Sketches of Former Monks*] in forty *chüan* is also there ascribed to Seng-yu. [This should read instead of *ssu-shih*, "forty," *shih-ssu*, "fourteen"]. This biographical collection is unmentioned in any other of the Buddhist catalogues, and it is clear that it is a mistake on the part of the authors of the *Sui-shu* bibliography. For a possible explanation of how this error could have arisen, see Wright, "Lives," pp. 412-413.

[84] Hayashiya, *Kokuyaku*, pp. 3-4.

[85] *T.* 55. *CST.* 1b.

of the fact that the *Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi* contains the prefaces and lists the titles of Seng-yu's other works, Hayashiya is of the opinion that it may well be the latest in order of authorship.[86]

In addition to the above eight works there are several others ascribed to Seng-yu in the *Li-tai san-pao chi* (*Records of the Triratna During Successive Dynasties*), a work compiled eighty years after Seng-yu's death by the Sui Dynasty monk Fei Ch'ang-fang.[87]

General Remarks on the Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi

Perhaps the greatest challenge the historian or philologist faces is the visualization and restoration from the fragmentary data which time has allowed him to study of a world in which bygone men and events were alive and meaningful. Certainly the most rewarding result of such research is the restoration of the past without distortion of values or content into cogent relationship with the historian's or philologist's own time.[88] For example, it is difficult for us to realize today in our age of rapid mass communication an era in which all such media were lacking. Yet such was the world of Seng-yu's day.

The difficulties attendant on the preservation and correct transmission of documents in a world prior to printing is indeed hard to imagine. Time and again we read that a certain chapter of an important text—or perhaps an entire work—had been translated in some area made remote either by geography or the incessant wars of the time—and had simply lain there unknown and unstudied.[89] The enormous hardships imposed on pious pilgrims in search of sacred texts such as Fa-hsien are, of course, well known. Often the same scripture would be translated wholly or in part by different men widely separated from each other both by time and place.[90] With times so uncertain, frequently scribes made copies in haste with a consequent loss only too often of vital information concerning the provenience of the copied or excerpted texts. Occasionally these texts —called by the people of the time *pieh-sheng* "separately engendered"—were erroneously entered in collections of scriptures as separate *Sūtra* and were considered to be entire works in their own right, or else they were incorrectly assigned to other works or authors.[91] At times works were preserved in a fragmentary manner; at other times the texts themselves were lost and only tables of contents, prefaces, postfaces, or notes of such works survived.

With records so confused, and with religious fervor or doctrinal bias supplying the motive, forgeries were easily perpetrated.[92] The more ancient texts readily lent themselves to this kind of forgery, and doctrines and concepts were insinuated in texts which originally were entirely free from them.[93] Moreover, the very nature of

[86] See his discussion of this point, *Kokuyaku*, p. 4.

[87] For a list of these, and problems concerned with them, see Hayashiya, *Kokuyaku*, p. 4.

[88] But it must be remembered that for all philological or historical labors, the past so restored is only a "counterfeit past." "An audience which appreciates that Mozart is not Wagner," J. R. Levenson says, "will never hear the eighteenth-century *Don Giovanni*." See his "'History' and 'Value': the Tensions of Intellectual Choice in Modern China," in *Studies In Chinese Thought*, ed. by A. Wright (Chicago, 1953), p. 146.

[89] In this regard, see *T.* 55. *CST.* 9. 62b, and *T.* 55. *CST.* 7. 48a for difficulties which Tao-an (312-385) experienced.

[90] For example, the early translations of the *Prajñāpāramitā* literature.

[91] T'ang, *History*, II, 588.

[92] The problem of forgeries of Buddhist texts is a subject which—despite its obvious importance—has as yet hardly been touched on by Western scholars. The making of forged *Sūtra* commenced during Tao-an's period (4th century). For example, Tao-an's catalogue lists twenty-five forged scriptures in twenty-eight *chüan*. That this practice proved of aid to the Chinese (particularly in the internecine warfare waged between the Taoist and the Buddhists as to which doctrine was more ancient) can be seen from the fact that approximately 130 years later, Seng-yu lists in his catalogue more than forty-five forged works (among these, there are so-called extracts from the *Sūtra* which numbered 275 *chüan*).

During the early Sui, we find that a distinction is made between those works which are "suspect" (*i-huo*), and those which are listed as outright "forgeries" (*wei-wang*). In the catalogue compiled in 594 by Fa-ching, and others, for example, we find some fifty-five works in sixty-eight *chüan* were "suspect"; 141 works in 314 *chüan* were declared "forgeries." See T'ang, *History*, II, 594-595. This shows just how popular this practice had become during the period of the Six Dynasties.

[93] Thus, Liang Ch'i-ch'ao claimed that the oldest Chinese Buddhist *Sūtra*, the *Ssu-shih-erh-chang-ching*, "contains *Mahāyāna* doctrines," and is therefore a forgery. T'ang Yung-t'ung, by a meticulous examination of various editions of this *Sūtra*, has shown how, and even the possible time at which, such *Mahāyāna* doctrines (particularly tenets of the Ch'an school) were interpolated into this scripture. See J. R. Ware's translation of T'ang's, "The Editions of the *Ssu-shih-erh-chang ching*," *HJAS*, I (1936), 147-155.

the corpus of Buddhist writings known as the *Tripiṭaka*—called a "canon" only in default of any better word, but which rather represents simply a repository of the most diverse traditions and miscellaneous sources—made any coherent arrangement of it very difficult.

Faced with the problems arising from such conditions, the study of bibliography assumed an increasingly important rôle among scholarly Chinese Buddhists. Indeed, the Sui Dynasty catalogue compiled by Chih-sheng and known as the *K'ai-yüan shih-chiao lu* [*Catalogue of Buddhism of the K'ai-yüan Era*] lists twenty-seven Buddhist bibliographies as having been compiled prior to the Sui.[94] And we should add to this list the *Fan-i li* of Chih-chi which dates from the Ch'en Dynasty.[95] Of all this number only the *Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi* has been preserved. The *Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi* therefore remains today the most valuable account of the history and content of the Chinese *Tripiṭaka* for the period covered by it, namely, from the Later Han to the Liang dynasties.

But it is also unique in other ways. Firstly, it is based primarily on the earlier catalogue compiled by the great Chin Dynasty monk Shih Tao-an (312-385), and this allows us some idea of the general arrangement of Tao-an's catalogue, which is no longer extant other than as quoted in Seng-yu's *Records*. Of even greater importance, however, is the fact that Seng-yu accepted and supplemented certain critical principles adopted from the earlier pioneer work.[96] These principles, invested as they were with the considerable authority of Tao-an as transmitted by Seng-yu, established precedents for all later Buddhist bibliographies. Finally, Seng-yu's *Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi* is a treasury of priceless information on the texts, periods, concepts, and great figures—both secular and clerical—of Chinese Buddhism during the most critical periods of its introduction and adaptation to the Chinese scene and, ultimately, to the Far Eastern world.

There has been some confusion as to how the title of the *Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi* should be translated, *ch'u* of the title being taken in the sense of "excerpt" or "extract."[97] As Yang Lien-sheng has pointed out, this is incorrect.[98] *Ch'u* is here an abbreviation for the technical Buddhist compound *i-ch'u*. And here, I believe, we are to understand this (to use Chao Yuen-ren's terminology) as a verb-complement compound. That is, *i-ch'u* means "translated [with the result that a book] is issued," or more simply, "translate." The title then ought be rendered not as *Excerpts from the Tripiṭaka*, but as *A Collection of Records on the* [*Issued* =] *Translated Tripiṭaka*. That this rendering is correct can be seen moreover from the contents. The integral part of the *Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi* does not consist of excerpts of quoted materials taken from the *Tripiṭaka*,[99] but rather consists of *Chi* "records" (or "notices") which are concerned with the compilation of the Chinese *Tripiṭaka* as such.

The *Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi* consists of three main divisions: *ching-lu*, "Bibliography of the *Sūtra*"; *ching-hsü*, "Prefaces to the *Sūtra*"; and *seng-chuan*, "Lives of the Monks." Of these the first division has traditionally been regarded as the nucleus of the collection, and this view is substantiated by the fact that it appears to have been the first section to have been compiled. Hence, the work is commonly referred to in Chinese and Japanese literature as the *Seng-yu lu*, *Sōyūroku*, i. e., simply, *Seng-yu's Bibliography*. It may be well to consider briefly each of these major sections.

---

[94] See *chüan* 10 of the *Shih-chiao lu*, and T'ang, *History*, II, 588.

[95] This was a catalogue of the translations made by Paramārtha during the Ch'en Dynasty.

[96] The more important principles which early Chinese Buddhist bibliographers used, and which go back to Tao-an's catalogue, were these:

(a). As regards those works of which the translator's names were lost—these works ought be listed, and an attempt made to identify the translators and places of translation by textual criticism.

(b). Forgeries should be identified and listed as such.

(c). Different translations of the same work should be listed, compared, and identified as belonging to one original text.

(d). Extracts should also be traced to their source.

(e). The titles of works lost, prefaces, and so forth, should be listed so as to provide a complete record for posterity. For a discussion of these and other points, see T'ang, *History*, II, 588, 590.

[97] Both Derk Bodde (in his *History*) and I (in a previous article) had erroneously understood *ch'u* in this sense.

[98] See his review of Bodde's translation of Fung's *A History of Chinese Philosophy*, II, in *HJAS*, XVII (1954), 482. Bunyū Nanjō, however, had correctly translated this in his *Catalogue of the Chinese Translations of the Buddhist Tripiṭaka*.

[99] Except, as in the first chapter, where these serve to supplement the records of the compilation of the Chinese *Tripiṭaka*.

The Bibliography Proper and its Relation to Tao-an's Catalogue

Of the fifteen rolls (*chüan*) into which the *Records* is now divided, this section consists of four rolls, that is, *chüan* two through *chüan* five (*chüan* one is an introductory chapter to the entire work). As mentioned earlier, this catalogue is the oldest extant bibliography of the Chinese *Tripiṭaka*, and it assumes therefore enormous significance for the study of the compilation of the *Ta-tsang-ching*, and for research on the filiation of the individual texts. Moreover, it serves as an invaluable check on the two principal later bibliographies for these earlier periods, the *Li-tai san-pao chi* [*Records of the Triratna During Successive Dynasties*] of Fei Ch'ang-fang, and the *K'ai-yüan shih-chiao lu* of Chih-sheng.

To no small extent the strength and weaknesses of Seng-yu's bibliography reflect those of the Tao-an catalogue, the *Tsung-li chung-ching mu-lu* [*Bibliographical Catalogue Comprehensively Arranging the Sūtra*].[100] It may be pertinent to note briefly Tao-an's catalogue and its relation to Seng-yu's.

Seng-yu speaks of Tao-an's bibliography as the "first." Though, strictly speaking, this is not true, yet there was considerable justification for Seng-yu's statement. Apparently the only authentic bibliography of Buddhist works prior to Tao-an was one compiled by a certain Chih Min-tu, which seems to be referred to by Seng-yu in a rather offhand manner as the *Chiu-lu*, the *Ancient Catalogue*.[101] This appears, however, to have been no more than a mere listing of titles. Moreover, Tao-an seems never to have seen the *Chih Min-tu Catalogue*.[102] Thus he was forced to study the texts themselves in great detail, and to investigate their style and their authors before compiling his bibliography. The result of these detailed researches was the creation of several lists of the *Sūtra*:[103]

1. If after Tao-an had collated the manuscripts for a certain work, had studied its style, wording, etc., and had explained its merits and defects, he still was unable to determine the time and place of its authorship, he then entered it in the *Shih-i lu* ("Catalogue of lost translators").

2. On the other hand, if from the style, etc., he could determine whether a given translation was of an ancient provenience or stemmed from more recent times, or whether it was translated in Kuan-chung, or in Liang-chou, he then would enter it, according to his judgment, in one of the following lists:

(1). "Catalogue of Ancient Different *Sūtra*" (*Ku-i-ching lu*);
(2). "Catalogue of Different *Sūtra* [translated in] the Liang land" (*Liang-t'u i-ching lu*);
(3). "Catalogue of Different *Sūtra* [translated in] Kuang-chung" (*Kuan-chung i-ching lu*)

Not only was Tao-an's methodology of the highest standards even when judged by those adopted today, but he seems to have had the true scholar's feeling for meticulous detail; for him, as for us, *Le Dieu est dans les détails*.[104] What makes Tao-an's catalogues most important for the period which they cover, namely, from the *Kuang-ho* era of the Han Dynasty (178 A.D.) up to the second year of *Ning-k'ang* of the Chin (374), is the fact that in his catalogue of works extant in his day

---

[100] Among criticisms made were the following points:
(a). Writing was somewhat confused and in the nature of a draft version rather than a polished work;
(b). Titles were introduced without too much order;
(c). Number of *chüan* not given.

[101] T'ang, *History*, II, 590.

[102] See A. Link (Tr.), "Various Traditions Concerning the Entry of Buddhism into China," *Phi Theta Annual Papers of the Oriental Languages Honor Society University of California*, IV (June, 1953), 80, note 76. For what is perhaps the most detailed study of the question of the early Chinese Buddhist catalogues, see Tokiwa Daijō, *Go-kan yori sō sai ni itaru yakkyō soroku* [*A Comprehensive Catalogue of the Translated Sūtra from the Later Han to the Sung and Ch'i*] (Tokyo, 1938).

[103] For these, see the catalogue proper of the *CST*. For a discussion of these, see T'ang, *History*, I, 207-212.

[104] This critical spirit is well illustrated by a quotation which Seng-yu made from Tao-an's bibliography in an entry on the preface to the notes on the *Shou-leng-yen san-mei ching*: "The Reverent [Tao-] an's *Bibliography of the Sūtra* states: 'On the eighth day of the second moon of the second year of the *Chung-p'ing* era [this work] was translated by Chih Ch'en. The beginning of the *sūtra* is minus "Thus have I heard" (*Evaṃ mayā śrutam*); it merely states, "The Buddha was in the city of Rājagṛha on the Gṛdhrakūṭa Mountain."'" See *T*. 55. *CST*. 7. 49a. 14. Of course, it must be remembered that this traditional introduction is for the Buddhists "an appointed time," a "coming together" (*samaya*) of four conditions, *viz.*: time, place, the teacher, and his audience; hence, it is important that a sacred text should indicate all of these elements in their proper order.

he listed only those works which he had himself personally examined. Unfortunately, bibliographers after Tao-an did not follow him in this excellent practice. Thus, in availing himself of Tao-an's work, Seng-yu already had a sound foundation on which to build, and established principles to guide him. Still, by the time Seng-yu wrote his catalogue, two hundred years had elapsed since the Western Chin Dynasty, and Seng-yu had therefore to cope with an enormous mass of translations, some of which, because of Tao-an's rule of never entering anything unless he had himself seen it, were omitted by the great Buddhist master of the Chin Dynasty. All in all, Seng-yu's bibliography remains the most reliable of the early Buddhist catalogues of the Chinese canon.

Prefaces to the Sūtra

The collection of prefaces in the *Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi* occupies five rolls (*chüan* six through eleven) and contains one hundred and ten prefaces. The assembling of these prefaces resulted from Seng-yu's travels in search of various collections of the Chinese *Tripiṭaka*. It seems likely that Seng-yu was assisted in these book hunting expeditions by the famous literary genius, Liu Hsieh, since according to one theory, Liu acted as the redactor-in-chief for the famous Ting-lin Ssu Canon. At any rate, this collection of prefaces served Seng-yu in good stead as they supplied much of the data for his compilation of the catalogue proper of his *Collection of Records*, as well as for his supplementary collection of biographical and hagiographical materials. This section contains three prefaces of his own, but the greater part of the prefaces were written by earlier men to various *Sūtra*, *Śāstra*, and *Vinaya* works. Although *chüan* twelve also contains a few prefaces, it actually represents a supplement to the previous bibliography proper and to the collection of prefaces, and hence is called a *tsa-lu*, or "Miscellaneous Catalogue." Since it contains a table of contents to Seng-yu's works,[105] as well as his prefaces to these, it is likely, as Hayashiya observes, that it was added as an addendum to the *Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi* in Seng-yu's declining years.

In some ways the prefaces to various other works by Seng-yu tell us more about his aims and methods than does the preface to the *Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi* itself. For example, at the end of his *Note to the Sūtra of the Wise and the Fool* (*Hsien yü ching chi*) we find the following instructive passage:[106]

> [I, Seng-] Yu, gathered together in a comprehensive fashion the *Sūtra-tripiṭaka*; making inquiries and searching far and near, I went in person for consultations, and made on the spot investigations of these things. I held in high honor those whose years were advanced, whose virtue was lofty, and whose hearts were straight, and relying on their illumination, I thence composed this register as a catalogue to inform later students about these matters.

Even more interesting in providing information concerning Seng-yu's motives for compiling the *CST* are his remarks in what appears to be the preface to his collected works written shortly before his death as a kind of *apologia pro vita sua*:[107]

> I have heard talk that falling tears aid [in augmenting] a river, and discussions that two handfuls of earth help form Mount Exalted (Tai-shan).[108] Though the ridiculing [of such small endeavors] commenced in the past, the shame [when such attempts are realized] is collected in the present.
>
> [I], Seng-yu, in drifting along in accordance with former causes [occasioned by the *karma* of my past lives] have been blessedly born in the Buddhist world (*Jambudvīpa*).[109] From my childish years I donned the dyed garb of the cleric and early was accounted among the number of monks. Yet my *Prajñā* understanding was not yet made very clear, and my taste for meditation (*Dhyāna*) was not noted. These breaths of moments (*kṣaṇa*)[110] accumulated in vain, and I had not yet—even in trifling amounts—created a basis for the zealous practice of a monk. For this reason I dreaded the gathering incense for the morning [repentence for sins committed], was ashamed at the moving bell for the evening [meditations]. Vast and illimitable this dirty [and calamitous] age; in vain the waste of this time.[111]
>
> Yet humbly I had an adamant vow (*praṇidhāna*) and set my aspiration on the *Mahāyāna*. I gave supreme reverence to the *Vaipulya* [scriptures][112] and set my heart aroaming in the *Four Āgama*.[113] In addition, I took [visiting] the quiet distances of mountain dwellings

[105] See *T.* 55. *CST.* 12. 87b.

[106] *T.* 55. *CST.* 9. 67c. 28.

[107] *T.* 55. *CST.* 12. 87a-b.

[108] That is, T'ai-shan, the most important of the five sacred peaks in China.

[109] In a larger sense, as here intended, *Jambudvīpa* means the Buddhist world; this would, naturally, include China.

[110] *Sha-na*, *kṣaṇa*, "moment."

[111] One is reminded of Saint Augustine's lament over his wasted youth.

[112] As here used, the *Mahāyāna* scriptures.

[113] Here standing for the *Hīnayāna* scriptures.

and the freshness of springs and thickets of pines, the periods of lectures on the mats, the extra days in the monks' service, and the searching of the canonical literature and the unrolling and perusal of it, to be my occupation.

At times I devoted the whole day to this, neglecting my meals; at other times, I spent the entire night [studying], extending [the day's light] with candles. Even though my strength was short, united ripples of but a foot struggle to gallop; even though my understanding was shallow, shadows of but an inch compete to show the passage of time.

Although repeatedly with my "view from a pipe" I misinterpreted the heavens, and with my "estimation of an ant" I had doubts about the sea; still with roving eyes and accumulated mindfulness I really had a slight awakening. Accordingly I brought together the precepts and words concerning the Treasure of the Law which I had heard . . .

In order to make manifest and clarify the response of Enlightenment, I therefore put in order the *Chronological Biography of Śākya*; to distinguish and elucidate the six destinies [of beings], I therefore composed the *Records of the Worlds*; in order to fix in correct order the *Sūtra* translated, I therefore compiled the *Catalogue of the Tripiṭaka*; in order to honor and to give reverence to the founders of the *Vinaya*, I therefore selected certain biographies of Master Teachers; in order to put in comprehensive order the sources of blessings, I therefore compiled the sections of the *Garden of the Dharma*; in order to protect and maintain the True Conversion, I therefore collected together the discussions which aggrandize and clarify it.

For a while when I was young, I received [instructions in] the study of the Laws, and engraved on my mind the *Vinaya*. Dawn and dusk I have intoned and maintained [these practices] for about forty years; the springs and autumns in which I have lectured and preached on them amount to more than seventy. Since I have been instructed in these doctrines by my former teacher, I have not dared to lay these aside or neglect them. I have [therefore] grouped together and issued several chapters as *Records of the Vinaya* (*Lü-chi*) in ten rolls, as well as *Records of Miscellaneous Inscriptions* (*Tsa-pei chi*), which I have compiled as one portfolio (*chih*). Inclusive of what has been collected, there are eight works (*pu*) . . . However, the [true] principles are far-reaching, my understanding limited, and there is much that I have not yet been able to comprehend . . .

Although much allowance must be made for some of these remarks as being only rhetorical flourishes common to his day and style, yet one cannot help feeling that when taken together in the context of his *Kao-seng chuan* biography these are the words of an old man, ready to leave "the sea of sorrows," who is attempting to justify his life's activities. Is there not also here some indication of his bitterness at having had his motives questioned by his fellow brethren?

Lives of the Monks

The biographical section of Seng-yu's *Records* (*chüan* thirteen through *chüan* fifteen) comprises thirty-two major biographies. It seems very likely that this biographical section, together with *chüan* one and *chüan* twelve, were added by Seng-yu later in his life to round out his *Collection of Records*. This theory is rendered all the more plausible since Seng-yu in his table of contents to his collected works (now included in *chüan* twelve of the *CST*) states that the *Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi* counted ten *chüan*.[114] These ten rolls probably refer to the four *chüan* of the bibliography proper and the six *chüan* of the collected prefaces.

It would be instructive to attempt to trace out the sources which Seng-yu used for his *Lives of the Monks*. Unfortunately, unlike his successor, Hui-chiao, he cited no sources. It is, of course, interesting to speculate, as Hayashiya has done,[115] that he may have used various earlier hagiographic collections by such authors as Fa-chi, Fa-chin, and Seng-pao. But all of this is rather futile speculation since none of these works has survived intact to our own day.

What is of more significance is the relationship which Seng-yu's biographical collection holds to its immediate successors: the *Ming-seng chuan* [*Lives of Famous Monks*] of Seng-yu's disciple, Pao-ch'ang, and the *Kao-seng chuan* [*Lives of Eminent Monks*] of Hui-chiao. Since, however, an admirable summary of the problems of this relationship has already been presented elsewhere,[116] I will not discuss them in any detail here. Suffice it to say that all of the thirty-two subjects given biographies in the *Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi* are alloted biographies (many quoted practically verbatim) in the *Kao-seng chuan*. For some unknown reason only twenty-seven of these (according to the extant table of contents) are allotted space in the *Ming-seng chuan*. Meticulous textual criticism of all these biographies will doubtlessly show special features of borrowing.[117] But this is beyond the scope of the present paper. Even a casual reading of these biographies, however, shows quite plainly Hui-chiao's enormous debt to Seng-yu's collection.

It is probable that the biographical section of

---

[114] *T.* 55. *CST.* 12. 87b.

[115] Hayashiya, *Kokuyaku*, p. 2.

[116] Wright, "Lives," Part 4: "The Sources of the *Kao-seng chuan*."

[117] See Wright, "Lives," p. 422; Link, "Remarks."

Seng-yu's *Records* has been preserved only by the fortuitous accident that it was appended to the bibliography proper and the collection of prefaces. Since these were considered as very important by later Buddhists, Seng-yu's biographies have survived where so many others have vanished even though they were superseded by Hui-chiao's brilliant hagiographical collection, the *Kao-seng chuan.*[118]

The Preface to the Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi

In the following short preface to his *Collection of Records On the Translated Tripiṭaka* Seng-yu attempts to sketch a brief outline of the classification of the scriptures, and of the history of the Buddhist translators and exegetes in China. In addition, he informs us of the reasons why he was led to make this collection, and of the critical methods which he used in assembling its materials. His style is allusive and suggestive and makes full use of the rich rhetorical devices of Buddhist writing common to the Six Dynasties period. To bring this across in English translation is not easy and I have, therefore, annotated this essay in some detail.

TRANSLATION

The Author's Preface

(*T.* 55. *CST.* 1. 1a)

Now the truly real (*paramārtha-satya*)[119] is mysterious and concentrated;[120] the nature of *dharma*[121] is

[118] Hayashiya, *Kokuyaku*, p. 2.

[119] In general, the sense of this paragraph is the contrasting of two realms of "truth" (*erh-ti*), namely, *paramārtha-satya* (*chen-ti*), noumenal truth, and *samvṛti-satya* (*su-ti*), phenomenal truth. Each of these realms is in its own terms "true," but it is the noumenal which is considered to be absolute from our standpoint of relative truth. That is to say, from our view (*darśana*) of "piecemeal truths," of desires, aims, and goals, realized in a definite time and place, absolute truth is conceived as "other." In an absolute sense, however, in the sense of noumenal truth as such, since there is no "other," there is no distinction made between these two realms.

Seng-yu uses perhaps the most common Chinese translation for *paramārtha-satya, chen-ti*, which I have rendered as the "Truly Real." In Sanskrit *paramārtha* has the connotations "highest sense; supreme aim; ultimate goal; absolute reality." In *Mahāyāna* Buddhism this term and its associated concepts come to play a paramount rôle, and an attempt to understand these Indian subtleties aroused heated discussions among native Chinese exegetes of the Buddhist texts.

To attain the absolute truth of *paramārtha-satya*, according to generally current Indian scholasticism of this period, a perfected saint, an *Ārya*, or a *Bodhisattva*, must first have realized the universal emptiness or relativity (*śūnyatā*) of all the differentiated ultimate elements of becoming, the *dharma* (*fa*). This he does by realizing through various stages of profound abstraction (*Dhyāna*) and spiritual or mental cultivation (*Bhāvanā*) (here scholasticism has run riot with a minute analysis and classification of these stages, degrees, and attainments) that all things originate in mutual relations which arise interdependently (*pratitya-samutpāda*), and that they are, therefore, lacking in anything corresponding to a substance or to an ego (*nairātmya, anātman, wu-wo*). He is thereby no longer under the general delusion (*moha, māyādṛṣṭi*) that these seemingly real entities are what they appear. Having understood the nature of the phenomenal veil (*samvṛti*), he intuits the principle of absolute universal equality (*samatā*, p'ing-teng), transcends the subject-object relationship (*grāhya-grāhaka*), and comprehends in perfect gnosis (*Prajñā*) the identity of the noumenal (i. e., the state of *Nirvāṇa*) and phenomenal (*saṃsāra*) realms. Here beyond even the possibility of error, or of paradox, he abides in silence in the "Truly So" (*Bhūtatathatā, chen-ju*). It is important to note that Buddhism remains true to its original inspiration: having commenced in the *mysterium tremendum* of the Buddha's Enlightenment, and run the full diapason of *Mādhyamika* dialectics, it again ends in *silence.*

[120] The words "mysterious and concentrated" (*hsüan-ning*) qualifying the "Truly Real" seem to be rather rarely used. They are not found, for example, in the *DKWJ* and, on a rather cursory reading of the *CST*, I found *hsüan-ning* used only once (*T.* 55. *CST.* 8. 59a. 23). In our text *hsüan* means "mysterious," and *ning* seems to connote "concentrated" in the sense of the "ultimate residue of things which can be known." (Cf. the use of *ning* in such expressions as *ning-chih, T.* 55. *CST.* 8. 53a. 7). Although *hsüan* is widely used in Chinese mystical, or semi-mystical literature, still we may observe that Taoist connotations of *hsüan*, particularly as occurring in the *Lao-tzu* (which, of course, were well-known to Seng-yu as to all literati of his period) harmonize from a Chinese viewpoint precisely with the usage of *hsüan* here.

In the passage, as famous as obscure, in the first chapter of the *Lao-tzu* which reads *hsüan chih yu hsüan, hsüan* is used to qualify the non-cognizable common origin of the two modalities of the Chinese (and particularly the Taoist) *Weltanschauung, yu,* "existence," and *wu* "nonexistence." And, as we have seen, *paramārtha*, in its Indian sense, represents the transcendental viewpoint wherein both the phenomenal and the noumenal realms are realized to be one in their absolute nature. Moreover, in the only other occurrance (as far as I know) of *hsüan-ning* in the *CST*, these words are used to qualify *yu-chih*, "arcane purport," and this hidden meaning is said to be "that which thought cannot attain." Although the evidence is far too slight

empty and quiescent,[122] and yet,[123] for "opening up things,"[124] and for guiding the worldly,[125] if it were not for words, there would be no conveyance [to salvation].[126] It is for this reason that the non-dualistic (*advaya*) reply of silence is grasped in the gate of the voidness of entities[127] (**artha-śūnya-mukha*), and that the [Buddha with but] one utterance[128] (*[Buddha]-śabda-ekāya*) could arouse a discriminating understanding sufficient to answer [the varied needs of] the realms of the thronging beings (*sattvāḥ*).[129]

---

to argue that the "common origin" of the Taoists represents for Seng-yu the transcendental state of *paramārtha-satya*, yet, even if it be no more than a coincidence, the possibility that it does do so is worth noting.

[121] *Fa-hsing, dharmatā, dharmadhātu = bhūtatathatā.*

[122] *Hsü-chi.* We read in a biographical notice on Harivarman (Ho-li-pa-mo) by Hsüan-ch'ang (416-484; biography in *T.* 50. *KSC.* 377a-377b), *wu-wen fo-chih hsü-chi, fei ming-hsiang so-i, shen-ch'eng miao-chüeh*: "I have heard that the Buddha's purport is *emptiness and quiescence* and that it not to be argued by names and signs; it is divinely clear, marvelously transcendent." (*T.* 55. *CST.* 11. 78c. 15). It is in this sense of *paramārtha* that the emptiness (*śūnya*) of all things is realized: the Buddhist saint sees in the beginningless commotion of the elements of becoming (*dharma*) paradoxically their absolute emptiness and utter quiescence. In this regard, one may recall the saying of the great disciple of Kumārjīva and Buddho-Taoist mystic, Seng-chao, "the raging storm [at the end of the world] which uproots mountains, actually is calm; the rushing streams do not flow; the hot air which can be seen in springtime rising from the surface of a lake is motionless; sun and moon though revolving in their orbits, do not turn around." (Translated by W. Liebenthal, *The Book of Chao* [Peking, 1948], p. 40). What Seng-chao attempts to convey by this poetic passage is that in the vision of the Buddhist mystic all phenomenal things are realized in their absolute nature to be static and unitary.

[123] Having dealt with, to use Anesaki's phrase, "the purely formal aspect of existence," the words "and yet" assume enormous importance since they here introduce the contrasting realm of phenomenal truth, the stage in which ordinary mankind finds itself. This is the empirical world of our sensory and mental constructions, of time, in space; in a word, it is the kaleidoscopic, paradoxical sphere of seemingly concrete particular facts. It is in this realm that an understanding of the doctrine, its preaching, and its wording, is of critical importance.

[124] Quoted from the *I-ching, Appendix* III; see James Legge's translation, *The Yi-king, Sacred Books of the East*, XI (Oxford, 1882), 371. The usual interpretation of this unusually terse phrase is that the saint reveals to the people that which they had not known, and accomplishes completely that which the people desire to see accomplished.

[125] That is, the profane, the *pṛthagjana.*

[126] Words are but one of the expedient means (*upāya*) which the Buddhist saint uses to instruct and save others. It is interesting to draw a comparison with Plato's conception of the philosopher-king, who also gradually introduces his people of the cave, concerned only with shadows, to the open air and sun of truth. Here, though, there is a fundamental difference: in the case of the *Mahāyāna* Buddhist who attained to the view of the "Truly Real," he would, of course, realize that there was neither person nor cave from the beginning!

[127] *I-k'ung chih men, arthaśūnyadvara,* or *artha-śūnyamukha,* i. e., the voidness of things (*śūnyatā*) in their absolute nature. But this nature cannot be grasped by discursive thought nor fully expressed by the dualism implicit in words. Thus, in the *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra* there is a chapter (*parivarta*) called "On entering through the *Dharma* Gate of Non-dualism" (*advaya-dharma-dvara*). This chapter describes how, after the thirty-one saints had each set forth his own views as to what constituted the characteristics (*lakṣaṇa*) of non-dualism, Manjuśri asked Vimalakīrti, "Since we have severally already set forth our own views, O Compassionate One (*Bhandata*), you ought tell us your own views. How may these *Bodhisattva* enter through the *Dharma* Gate of Non-dualism?" When Vimalakīrti still remained silent and said nothing, Manjuśri exclaimed, "Excellent! Then, when one arrives at having neither words nor language that is truly to enter through the Gate of the Law of Non-dualism!" On this passage Seng-chao comments: "The above several *Bodhisattva* had stated in words [their views] as to the characteristics of the *Dharma.* Manjuśri [also] had words about having no words. These three [ways of] clarifying the Standard, although identical [in purport], yet, after all, have [differences in] profundity and superficiality." Quoted from Ting Fu-pao (ed.), *FHTTT*, 2729c.

Recently two scholars have attempted to show the logic which is inherent in Nāgārjuna's formulation of the theory of *śūnyatā*, namely, Hajime Nakamura in his article *Kukan no kigo ronrigaku teki ketsumei*, ["Some Clarifications of the Concept of Voidness from the Standpoint of Symbolic Logic"] in *Indōgaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, V (Sept., 1954), 219-231, and Richard H. Robinson in his "Same Logical Aspects of Nāgārjuna's System," in *Philosophy East and West*, VI (Jan., 1957), 291-308. Among the formal, non-intuitive definitions offered by Nakamura is the possibility that emptiness equals the null class. Robinson's interpretation, not among those suggested by Nakamura, is that in the *Mūlamādhyamaka-kārikā* the "emptiness class is not null, but is co-extensive with the universal class."

Though such analysis may clarify Nāgārjuna's system, for Chinese such as Seng-yu non-dualistic truth was a "mystery," an inexpressible.

[128] See P. Demiéville (ed.), *Hōbōgirin*, III, 215, *s. v. button.*

[129] Hayashiya, *Kokuyaku*, p. 7, note 2, notes that this passage, which reads *i-yin chen-pien ying hu ch'un-yu chih ching* is paraphrased from a corresponding passage in the *Fo-kuo p'in* (*Buddha-kṣetra parivarta*) of the *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra* which reads *Fo i i-yin yen-shuo fa, chung-sheng sui-lei k'o te chieh*: When the Bud-

From that time when our teacher Powerful-in-loving-kindness (*Śākyamuni*) [180] came forth in this world;

dha with one utterance elucidates and preaches the *Dharma*, the many beings, according to their classes, severally are able to understand." Seng-yu's first paragraph in this preface seems to be derived in large part from Seng-chao's preface to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*: "The *Vimalakīrti* is a *Sūtra* that is inconceivable; on the whole, it is an appelation that exhausts subtilties, fully realizes the transforming powers (*hua*), and is supernally transcendent. Its purport, profound and mysterious, is not something which words or symbols can fathom. *Bodhi* (*Tao*) goes beyond the three voids; it is not something that can be conceived by those of the two careers. It excels the outer region of the thronging categories (*ch'ün-shu*) [of things?], and transcends the realms of sentient beings (*yu-hsin*). Vast it is and illimitable! "I do not know why it is so, yet its very ability to be so lies in its inconceivability." Indeed, the wisdom of the Sage is lacking in knowledge, yet the myriad classes [of things] are all illumined; the *Dharmakāya* has no likeness, yet in different forms it responds in all cases; the perfect harmony is unworded, yet in mysterious expressions (*chi*) it all the more spreads about; the inscrutable expediency (*ch'üan*) is without plans, yet it moves with appropriate conditions (*shih-hui*): it is just because of these reasons that [the Sage] is able universally to save [all beings in the various] quarters; that he is able "to open up things and to accomplish [all] tasks," and that he can profitably show that the world and I have no ado. Yet nevertheless, the confused, on beholding the illumination resulting from being spiritually moved (*kan-chao*), subsequently speak of it as wisdom; on contemplating its responsive forms, they speak of these as persons; on observing its mysterious expressions, they call these words; on seeing its changes and movements, they call these expedients.

Nor for the culmination of the Way (*Tao-chi-che*), how may one express its supernal realm by forms, words, expedients, or wisdom! And yet, as regards the thronging beings in their long sleep, if it were not for words, there would be no awakening. The Way (*Tao*) does not revolve alone; the aggrandizement of it is due to men. This is why the *Tathāgata* entrusted his instructions to Manjuśri (Wen-shu) in different quarters, and commissioned Vimalakīrti in other lands (**digantara*), and, therefore, had them gather in Vaiśāli (P'i-yeh), that they might together aggrandize this Way.

What this scripture makes clear [*T.* 55. *CST.* 8. 58b] is, in general, the myriad practices—and as concerns these, it takes expediency and wisdom as principal points of emphasis.

For planting the stock of virtue, it takes the Six *Pāramitā* (*liu-tu*) as the trunk-root; for saving the benighted and confused, it takes mercy and compassion as chief; for expressing the culmination of the doctrine (*tsung-chi*), it takes non-dualism (*advaya*) for its wording. In general, all of this that is said—is at its basis—inconceivable . . ."

Some notes on the preceding text: *hua* ordinarily would refer to the spontaneous transformations produced by nature (*tzu-jan*, the "Self-so"); here it may also carry the connotation of the "transforming powers" of the *Bodhisattva*. "Long sleep" means the sleep of this life, the dream conjured up by ignorance. The three voids (of which there are three sets) likely refer to the voidness of self, *dharma*, and all phenomena.

It is not by chance that Seng-yu quotes from the *Vimalakīrti*, nor that Seng-chao wrote a commentary upon it. The popularity of the *Vimalakīrti* was assured from the time of its translation by Kumārajīva (up to this time it had been translated twice and was to become as well-known as the *Prajñā-pāramitā* literature in Kumārajīva's day; see Liebenthal, *The Book of Chao*, p. 5, note 22). Indeed, the conversion of Seng-chao from a scholar having a profound interest in Taoism to a Buddhist monk is said, according to his biographer, Hui-chiao, to have been occasioned by his having read the older version of the *Vimalakīrti*, the translation of Chih Ch'ien, *T.* no. 474. (See *T.* 50. *KSC.* 6. 365a. 13-14). [Seng-chao later wrote a commentary on Kumārajīva's new translation (for the latter see *T.* no. 475; for the commentary, *T.* no. 1775)].

Despite Arthur Waley's statement that "it was the legend of Vimalakīrti, with all its popular oral expansions . . . ," rather than the text itself, which fascinated the Far East (E. Conze, Ed., *Buddhist Texts Through The Ages* (Oxford, 1954), p. 272), the number of commentaries written on this scripture in China and Japan is sufficient to discredit this view.

The popularity of the *Vimalakīrti* was due not only to the legend and the oral expansions (though these did serve to make it popular among the less literate) but to the subject matter of the text itself. Vimalakīrti appealed to the Chinese and Japanese aristocrats because *he was presented as a lay Bodhisattva*. He lives the life of the householder; he is married and a father; enormously wealthy and powerful, intellectually brilliant, a witty talker, he confounds with his saintliness even the followers of the older ascetic monastic tradition. As a lay figure, who is also a *Bodhisattva*, he represents the *Mahāyāna* ideal of a universal salvation, a salvation truly open to all. He thus became a model for the devout—but not too devout—Buddhists of the gentry class both in China (particularly, in South China during Seng-yu's period) and in Japan. (See on this especially chap. 5, "Buddhism in China and Korea," by Zenryū Tsukamoto in Morgan (ed.), *The Path of the Buddha* (New York, 1956), p. 188, and A. Wright, "Buddhism in Chinese Culture: Phases of Interaction," p. 25). In Japan, for example, under the Fujiwara, a special period was reserved on the court calendar for the recitation and elucidation of the *Vimalakīrti*; there is still extant a commentary traditionally ascribed to Prince Shōtoku (though he may not have been its author but only its sponsor) which dates from the period of the introduction of Buddhism to Japan. See T. de Bary (ed.), Sources of the Japanese *Tradition* (New York, 1958), pp. 101-102.

For the vogue of Vimalakīrti in Buddhist art, see

when in the Deer Park (*Mṛgadava*) he intoned his first words;[131] until that time when by the Gold River (*Hiraṇyavatī*)[132] he concluded his last sermon, the "tallying scriptures"[133] (*sūtra*) were used to entice the "little learners,"[134] the extensive canon (*vaipulya*)[135] to exhort the "great-hearted."[136]

In the marvelous [turning of] the wheel [of the Law][137] ([*dharma-*] *cakra-*[*pravartana*]) there is differentiated the twelve-membered [division of the scriptures][138] (*dvādaśāṅga-*[*dharma-pravacana*]); in the collections of the *dharma* some eighty-thousand gates[139] (*aśīti-dharma-skandha-sahasrāṇi*) are found to be of comprehensive importance.

Coming to that time when the Well-departed[140] (*Sugata*) concealed his traces[141] (*parinirvāṇa*), the Respondent Realized Ones[142] (*Arhat*) compiled the Storehouse [of the Law] (*Tripiṭaka*). At first there were the collected scriptures of the *Four Āgama*;[143] next, of the Five Schools, the *Vinaya* with its divisions.[144] When the Great Treasures (*mahāratna*) thus were in existence, sentient beings[145] could be aided by them.

But the Way is aggrandized by men,[146] and the Law awaits opportune conditions[147] to be manifested. There may be the Way (*mārga*), but there may be no one [spiritually mature enough to follow it]. Although texts exist, yet there may be no Enlightenment; there may be the *Dharma*, yet there may be lacking opportune conditions; and though both may be present, yet none may hearken [to them].

Hearing the Law is dependent upon the coming of the proper season; to be enlightened about the Way is contingent upon the arrival of a suitable occasion. If a suitable occasion arrives, afterwards one can be moved by [true] principles;[148] if the proper season comes, afterwards one can penetrate via transformational processes.[149]

J. LeRoy Davidson, "Traces of Buddhist Evangelism in Early Chinese Art,' *Artibus Asiae*, XI (1948), 251-265. For the influence of this *Sūtra* on the kindred art of poetry, see R. Mather, "The Landscape Buddhism of the Fifth-century Poet Hsieh Ling-yün," 73.

[130] *Neng-jen*, a translation of Śākyamuni ("Sage of the *Śākya*, an epithet of the Buddha) based on a false etymology; see James R. Ware, *TP*, XXXIII, 116.

[131] Reference to the famous "first sermon" preached by the Buddha, the *Dharma-cakra-pravartana-sūtra*; for a translation and discussion of this see Edward J. Thomas, *The Life of Buddha as Legend and History* (New York, 3rd ed., 1948), pp. 87-88; for a convenient edition with textual criticism, see Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Reader* (New Haven, 1953), pp. 15-23. The Deer Park, known as Ṛṣipatana (Isipatana), was located in the modern Sārnāth.

[132] A river located near Kuśinagara, the site of the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa*.

[133] *Ch'i-ching*; here the *Sūtra* designated are the *Hīnayāna*, the texts of the *Āgama*.

[134] Hīnayānists.

[135] In a general sense, the *Mahāyāna* works; cf., for example, *T.* 55. *CST.* 7. 50c. 26: *Fang-teng-che ta-sheng chih t'ung-ming*, "*Fang-teng* (*Vaipulya*) is an interchangeable name for the *Mahāyāna*."

[136] The *Bodhisattva*, as contrasted to the *Śravaka* and *Pratyekabuddha*, the "little learners."

[137] The preaching of the word of the Buddha.

[138] *Shih-erh wei pu = shih-erh pu ching*. These are *Sūtra, Geya, Gāthā, Nidāna, Itivṛttaka, Jātaka, Adbhūtadharma, Avadāna, Upadeśa, Udāna, Vaipulya, Vyākaraṇa*. For a brief discussion of these divisions according to form and content, see Maurice Winternitz, *A History of Indian Literature. Buddhist Literature and Jaina Literature*, II (Calcutta, 1933), 9-10, and *BD*, 2337c-2339a.

[139] Usually given as *pa-wan-ssu-ch'ien fa-yün, caturaśīti-dharma-skandha-sahasrāṇi*, i.e., the eighty-four thousand instructions of the Buddha contained in the *Dvādaśāṅga-sūtra* which serve as "antidotes" for the eighty-four thousand defilements. Here the number is used in the sense of "a very large figure."

[140] An epithet of the Buddha, perhaps devised analogically from *Tathāgata*, the "Thus-Come."

[141] *Hui-chi*; cf. a similar expression by Tao-an: *Tzu fo chi-yu, a-nan so-ch'uan fen-wei san-tsang*, "From that time when the Buddha *went into the distant dark* (*nirvāṇa*), the [*sūtra*] which were transmitted by Ānanda were separated to form the *Tripiṭaka*." *T.* 55. *CST.* 10. 70a. 18.

[142] *Ying-chen*, i.e., those who, having realized the truth, answer the prayers and needs of mankind. For the equivalence see *T.* 55. *CST.* 1. 5a. 21.

[143] The division of the *Hīnayāna* canonical texts, namely, *Dīrghāgama, Madhyamāgama, Samyuktāgama, Ekottarikāgama*.

[144] Hayashiya, *Kokuyaku*, p. 7, note 8, observes that the schools referred to here are the *Dharmaguptakāḥ, Fa-tsang pu*, the *Mahīśāsakāḥ, Hua-ti pu, Mahāsaṅghikāḥ, Ta-chung pu, Sarvāstivādāḥ, I-ch'ieh-yu pu*, and *Kāśyapīyāḥ, Yin-kuang pu*, with their divisions of the *Vinaya*. On the confusing question of the relationship between these and other early *Hīnayāna*, or Hīnayānistic schools, see especially André Bareau, *Les Sectes Bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule. Publications de l'École Français d'Extrême-Orient*, XXXVIII (Saigon, 1955).

[145] *Han-shih*, literally, "holding intelligence," usually given as *yu-hsin*, or *yu-ch'ing*.

[146] Cf. a similar statement in the previously quoted passage from Seng-chao's preface to the *Vimalakīrti*, note 129 of this paper; an almost identical statement is made in *T.* 55. *CST.* 11. 80a. 13, and in *T.* 55. *CST.* 10. 74a. 10.

[147] "Opportune conditions" translates *yüan*, which I take to be an abbreviation here for *yüan-chi*. In this case, "opportune conditions" refers to receptivity to the *Dharma* produced as the result of good *karma* from past lives. See *FHTTT*, 2631a.

[148] *Li-kan*.

[149] *Hua-t'ung*, a phrase used by the Taoists, among others, in the sense of understanding and going along with the marvelous Way of the Self-so (*Tzu-jan*), the spontaneity of nature. The phrase is used, for example, in the *Huai-nan-tzu, Li-hsing ch'ü-chih tung-yü hua-*

Long ago during the Chou Dynasty the Enlightened One[150] (*Buddha*) arose, yet the Sacred Conveyance[151] came to be cut off;[152] in the generation of the Han there was the Simulated Doctrine[153] (*pratirūpaka-dharma*), and the Marvelous Canon[154] then began to circulate. That the Law awaits opportune conditions to be manifested truly is evidenced from this.

Coming to the end of the Han, An [Shih-] kao[155] put out translations,[156] and by turns [the Law] was made clear; at the beginning of the Wei, K'ang [Seng-] hui[157] made annotations on the transmitted texts [and the Buddhist concepts] gradually became perspicuous. That the Way is aggrandized by men is proved in these instances.

From the renaissance[158] of the Chin House the *Tripiṭaka* became ever more extensive, and the "Victorious Guests" from foreign regions in groups arrived together. On the "Middle Plain"[159] wise scholars resplendently and gloriously arose. [Saṅgha]de[va][160] and

---

t'ung shih wei tso-wang, "Departing from shapes, getting rid of knowledge, penetrating via *hua-t'ung*, this is called sitting with blank mind." In this passage one is reminded by *li-hsing* of the famous *I-ching* passage, *hsing erh shang*, i.e., "what is above shapes," and of the statement in the *Lao-tzu* about getting rid of knowledge. In a Buddhist sense, *hua*, "transformational processes," also has the connotation of "the transcendent powers of salvation employed by the *Buddha* and *Bodhisattva*." Here, as elsewhere in these texts, the Buddhist and Taoist meanings tend to coalesce.

[150] *Chüeh*, "Enlightened." I construe this with Hayashiya, *Kokuyaku*, p. 1, to mean *Chüeh-che*, the "Enlightened One."

[151] For some reason unknown (there is no textual evidence for the emendation, and he makes it *sub rosa*), Hayashiya reads for *ling-chin*, "Sacred Conveyance," *Ling-lü*, "Sacred Ordinance"; perhaps this is an error in printing. However, this preface, as quoted in the *Ta-t'ang nei-tien lu*, does give the variant *yün*, "cloud," for *ling*, "sacred."

[152] A popular tradition during Seng-yu's period was the theory that China had already learned of the birth of the Buddha during the Chou Dynasty. These early records were, so the Buddhists said, subsequently lost in the "infamous" burning of books which occurred in 213 B.C. during the reign of Ch'in Shih-huang-ti. This is doubtlessly a reference to this tradition. For a thorough study of these early traditions see my translation of the first chapter of T'ang Yung-t'ung's *Han wei liang-chin nan-pei ch'ao fo-chiao shih* entitled "Various Traditions Concerning the Entry of Buddhism into China," in the *Phi Theta Annual Papers of the Oriental Language Honor Society of the University of California*, IV (June, 1953), 31-93.

[153] In a technical sense *hsiang-chiao*, variant *hsiang-fa*, designates that period of the Buddha's teachings when only a similitude of the true doctrine remains. Various durations have been given for this time, one theory holding that five hundred years after the *Nirvāṇa* the period of *pratirūpaka-dharma* would commence to last for a thousand years. Tsukamoto is of the opinion that, as used especially during the *Nan-pei-ch'ao* period, these terms simply designate Buddhism. On *pratirūpaka-dharma*, see *BD*, 1178a; *FHTTT*, 2488b, 2489a; for Tsukamoto's view see Leon Hurvitz, (ed.), *Wei Shou Treatise On Buddhism and Taoism; an English Translation of the Original Chinese Text of Wei-shu CXIV and the Japanese Annotation of Tsukamoto Zenryū. Reprinted from Yün-kang, the Buddhist Cave-temples of the Fifth Century A.D. in North China Vol. XVI Supplement* (Kyoto, 1956), p. 61, note 2, and my remarks concerning this view in the review of this work in *JAOS*, LXXVII (Jan-March, 1958), 68.

[154] The *Tripiṭaka*.

[155] Supposedly originally a Parthian prince; biographies in *T.* 55. *CST.* 13.95a, and in *T.* 50. *KSC.* 1. 323a; see also P. C. Bagchi, *Le Canon Bouddhique en Chine*, I (Paris, 1927), 8-37.

[156] P. Demiéville, "La *Yogācārabhūmi* de Saṅgharakṣa," *BEFEO*, XLIV (1954), 342, has called attention to the fact that Seng-yu makes a distinction between the terminology of An Shih-kao, An-hsüan, Yen Fo-t'iao, Chih Yüeh (or Chih Ch'ien), and Chu Shu-lan, who turned out translations during the Han and the Three Kingdoms, and that of such translators as Kumārjīva, Buddhabhadra, and Dharmakṣema, and their students. Seng-yu speaks of the former as "ancient," the latter, as "modern." Demiéville (*loc. cit.*) would classify these, respectively, as "archaic" and "ancient," and reserve "modern" for the terminology found in the translations made by such men as Hsüan-tsang, I-ching, and Amoghavajra.

[157] Of Sogdian (*K'ang*) extract, *Seng-hui's* (died 280) ancestors had lived for several generations in India. From there his father had moved as a trader to Tongking. Seng-hui is renowned as one of those who introduced Buddhism into the area around the modern Nanking, and as an annotator and exegete; on him, see also note 30 of this paper.

[158] "Renaissance" translates *chung-hsing*, otherwise written *fu-hsing*. Ordinarily this would designate a revival of dynastic *Te* ("virtue," "power"). Here, however, "renaissance" has a specifically Buddhist sense: it refers to the renaissance of Buddhism which took place after the arrival of Kumārajīva in the capital. See Hayashiya, *Kokuyaku*, p. 205, note 3. In the expression *chung-hsing*, *chung* has the same sense as *fu*, "again." Concerning this term as it is ordinarily used, see Yang Lien-sheng, "Toward a Study of Dynastic Configurations in Chinese History," *HJAS*, XVII (1954), 332.

The following expression in the text above, *sheng-pin*, "victorious guests," designates the foreign monks, followers of the Victorious One, the Buddha.

[159] The lower course of the Yellow River corresponding approximately to the area of the modern Honan, the western part of Shantung, the southern part of Hopei and Shansi, and the eastern section of Shensi.

[160] T'i, an abbreviation for Seng-ch'ieh-t'i-p'o, a Kashmirian monk who came to Ch'ang-an in 383, traveled to Mount Lu in 391, and visited the modern Nanking area in 398. He translated, among other works, the *Abhidharma-jñāna-prasthāna*, the *Abhidharma-vibhāṣa*, and the *Abhidharma-hṛdaya-śāstra*.

[Kumāra]jī[va] [161] raised aloft its (i.e., Buddhism's) vast mainstays,[162] and [Tao-] an and [Hui-] yüan shook its arcane bonds.[163] On the banks of the Wei attention was devoted to the gathering of the "Carefree Wanderers"; [164] and on Mount Lu there was the binding together of those on the Wisdom (*Prajñā*) Estrade.[165] The Simulated Doctrine (*pratirūpaka-dharma*) gained men, thereupon, and became flourishing.

From the beginning, the *Sūtra* came out of the Western Regions and spread over the Eastern Quarter; [166] they were carried ten thousand *li* and translated from the Hu language into Chinese. As the utterances of the countries each had their own special distinctions,[167] therefore, the texts have similarities and differences; since earlier and later they came at different times, therefore, there is the new and the old in regard to their titles.[168] Such being the case, later scholars rarely were able to investigate and verify these; consequently, books were copied one after the other, and yet one did not know the year of the translation of the *Sūtra*. Cantors and preachers were shoulder to shoulder, yet none could find out the men who transmitted the Law; teachers and recipients of the Way also were missing.

Now if [among] the Holy Scriptures of the first period there still were five topics [169] to be proved in the *Sūtra*, how much more is this the case for the mingled translations of a thousand years; [170] how, indeed, may one leave these men and their times in oblivion?

Long ago the Master of the Dharma [Tao-] an, with his vast gifts and deep insight, [*T.* 55. *CST.* 1. 1b] had at that time compiled a catalogue of the *Sūtra*.[171] Having fixed and correctly arranged what he had himself heard and seen, [the texts of the *Sūtra*] were distinguished clearly. Since that time the Marvelous Canon has gradually appeared [in translations], and all [these texts] were like a precious sea of the *Mahāyāna*. At the time, men vied with one another in expounding and reciting [the scriptures], yet as regards dates and persons' names, none had a means by which to estimate and judge these. As years and months passed by, the sources began to disappear and later students became doubtful and confused. From what could they gain clarification?

---

[161] Kumārajīva is usually considered to be the greatest of the foreign translators in China. He is noted for having commenced a new epoch in the transmission of Buddhism to China both by reason of the excellence of his Chinese translations from the Sanskrit as well as by his profound understanding of what would suit the Chinese *Zeitgeist*. Kumārajīva arrived in Ch'ang-an on Feb. 8, 402; he died in China in 413. For a translation of his *KSC* biography, see J. Nobel, "Kumārajīva," *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, XX (1927), 206-233. Ui Hakaju has recently published a chronology for Kumārājīva in his *Shaku Dōan Kenkyū* (Tokyo, 1956), pp. 194-201.

[162] Both "vast mainstays" and later "arcane bonds" are rhetorical metaphors meaning here the "principal points and doctrinal concepts of Buddhism." These are likened metaphorically to the chief supporting bonds of a net (the net of the Law).

[163] Tao-an (312-385) was the greatest Chinese Buddhist personality up through his day. His life reflected in many ways the maturation and transformation of the obscure Indian cult of Buddhism in China into a "Chinese Buddhism." For a translation of his *KSC* biography see, A. Link, "Biography of Shih Tao-an," *TP*, XLVI (1958), 1-48.

Hui-yüan (334-416), Tao-an's greatest Chinese disciple, was the founder of the famous community at Lu-shan.

[164] The reference is to the group of translators and students whom Kumārajīva had gathered around him in the Hsiao-yao yüan, a large site to the NW of Ch'ang-an on the banks of the Wei river. For sources on the topography of Ch'ang-an during the Fu Ch'in Dynasty, see Walter Liebenthal, *The Book of Chao* (Peking, 1948), p. 2, note 6.

[165] In 402 Hui-yüan led a group of Buddhist monks at Mount Lu in pronouncing solemn vows to be reborn in the Western Paradise. This is described in Hui-yüan's *KSC* biography (*T.* 50. *KSC.* 6. 358c) as follows:

"The Master of the *Dharma*, Shih Hui-yüan, whose pure yearning was profound and mysterious, and whose lofty affection was especially manifest, then invited and had a hundred and twenty-three gentlemen of like mind, who pacified their hearts (*śramaṇa*), men of pure faith, gather on the shaded [northern] slope of Mount Lu before the image of Amitabha in the *Vihāra* of the Cloudy Estrade of Wisdom (*Prajñā*), and having taken incense and flowers and reverently offered these, led them in pronouncing vows there."

Traditionally the Pure Land sect is said to begin with this. This sect is, next to the Ch'an (Zen), the most popular of all the Chinese Buddhist sects. Although it is not quite true to say that Hui-yüan founded the Pure Land doctrine, it is certainly true that he and his disciples made great contributions to the Pure Land faith.

[166] China.

[167] That is, the languages differed so that the translations, and particularly, the transliterations were not the same.

[168] Translating somewhat differently, the latter part of this passage would read, "Since there is a sequence in the time of their arrival, their titles, therefore, are new or old."

[169] *Wu-shih*, i.e., the five points raised by Mahādeva (Ta-t'ien). According to Vasumitra's *Samayabhedoparacanacakra* (*T.* no. 2031, the *I-pu tsung lun lun*; cf. Paramārtha's translations, *T.* no. 2032, 2033) in the time of King Aśoka a hundred years after the *Nirvāṇa*, the Buddhist Order was for the first time rent by schism over five topics raised by Mahādeva. For a translation of Vasumitra's treatise in which a list of these topics is given, see W. Wassiljew, *Der Buddhismus. Sein Dogmen, Geschichte und Literatur* (St. Petersburg, 1860), pp. 246-247; see also M. Walleser, *Die Sekten des alten Buddhismus* (Heidelberg, 1927); André Bareau, *Les Sectes Bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule*.

[170] *Ch'ien-tsai chiao-i*, meaning the points of difference between the different schools as they appear in the Chinese translations.

[171] The *Tsung-li chung-ching mu-lu*.

[I, Seng-] Yu, with my middling and superficial gifts, have long entrusted myself to the Gate of the Dharma,[172] and have gazed aloft to the Mystic Mode, having made a vow (*praṇidhāna*) [173] to aggrandize the Great Conversion. When there came dusk or dawn, I intoned and cherished [the sacred scriptures]; in the autumn and summer I expounded and lectured. There was never an occasion but that my heart did not gallop to the *Ām[rapālī]* [174] Garden, my shadow leap to the Spirit Vulture Peak (*Gṛdrakūṭa*).[175] Thereupon, sticking to my task and with untiring purpose, skirting the waves, I sought out the sources, and bringing together that which I had heard, I called it a *Collection of Records on the Translated Tripiṭaka* (*Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi*).

The first [section] compiles records of historical data [concerning the compilation of the *Tripiṭaka*]; [176] the second, gives a critical catalogue of names; [177] the third, a comprehensive collection of prefaces to the *Sūtra*; [178] and the fourth, a narration of biographies.[179] If the historical data are compiled, then the original basis [of the *Dharma*] can be made manifest; if the catalogue of names gives a critical estimate, then the titles of the [various] periods will not be dropped by the wayside; if the prefaces to the scriptures are comprehensive, then the times of the Victorious Assemblying (i. e., compilation of the *Tripiṭaka*) will be sufficient to be verified; if the biographies are narrated, then a particular person's reputation can be seen.

I did both penetrating research on the esoteric scriptures [180] and thoroughly investigated the exoteric; [181] I compared them with prior experience, and verified them with old knowledge. If there was proof of a man's period, then [such dates] were set forth to serve as a controlling guide; if there were no details for a hearsay tradition, then the text reverted to the doubtful and defective [category].

Grasping the writing tablets and concentrating on the brush, my aspiration is set on preserving a veritable history; [each item] I reconsidered thrice over, thought through nine times, that the things [here recorded] might obtain a true catalogue. When those that have proof are set forth clearly, then those which have no source will be obvious by themselves. It is my earnest desire that wayside water will not be mixed with the pure rich liquid,[182] and that the stone of Yen will not be confused with the jade of Ch'u. Yet with my "knowledge circumscribed by a well" and my "vision limited by a pipe" [183] I very much feel my lack of erudition and expertness. If there is aught here that is incomplete, may it be entrusted to the wise and sagacious.

---

[172] The "Gate of the Doctrine," *dharmaparyāya*, i. e., the entrance into the truth, the door to Enlightenment. The following terms "Mystic Mode," and "Great Conversion," are likewise used as rhetorical expressions meaning "Buddhism."

[173] Cf. the same statement made by Seng-yu in *T.* 55. *CST.* 12. 87a.

[174] *An-yüan*, an abbreviation for *An-p'o-p'o-li yüan*, *Āmrapālivana*, the garden given by Āmrapālī to Śākyamuni. See *BD*, 92a.

[175] A mountain located near Rājagṛha, and renowned as the site of the preaching of the most important *Mahāyāna Sūtra*. Numerous legends are associated with this peak. See *BD*, 519a.

[176] *Yüan-chi*, i. e., the circumstances of the compilation of the *Tripiṭaka*; *chüan* one of the *CST*.

[177] This comprises essentially *chüan* one through five.

[178] *Chüan* six through eleven, comprising 110 prefaces.

[179] *Chüan* thirteen through fifteen, containing thirty-two major biographies.

[180] Buddhist works.

[181] Secular works.

[182] This might in an Indic context designate "milk"; however, in a Chinese context it might mean only the "essence." The sense of this and the following sentence is that precious things must not be mixed with common or impure things.

[183] Well-known Taoist clichés for limited knowledge.

An-hsüan 安玄
An Shih-kao 安世高
An-yüan 卷圓
chai. 齋
Ch'ao-yang men 朝陽門
Ch'en chün 陳郡
Cheng-tu 正度
chen-ju 真如
chen-ti 真諦
Ch'en Yüeh chi(samudaya) chi 沈約集籍
Chiang-ning fu 江寧府
ch'i-ching 契經
Chien-an 建安
Chien-ch'u ssu 建初寺
Ch'ien-tsai chiao-i 千載文譯
Chien-yeh 建業
Chih Ch'en 支識
Chih-chi 智敬
Chih Ch'ien 支謙
Chih Min-tu 支愍度
Chih-sheng 智昇
chih-tao 至道
Chih-tsang 智藏
Chih Tun 支遁
Chih Yüeh 支越
Ching-ling 竟陵
ch'ing-t'an 清談
Chin-kuang-ming ching 金光明經
Chi-pin 劇賓
Chiu-lu 舊錄
ch'üan 權
chüeh 覺
Chung-hsiang 鐘祥
chung-hsing 中興
Chung-kuo wen-hsüeh-chia ta-tz'u-tien 中國文學家大辭典
Chung-seng hsing-chuang 衆僧行狀
Chung-shan 鐘山
Ch'ün-shu 群書
chün-tzu 君子
Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi 出三藏記集
Chu Shu-lan 竺叔蘭
Chu-ssu pei-wen 諸寺碑文
Fa-chi 法濟
Fa-chi 法集
Fa-chi 法記
Fa-chin 法進
Fa-ching 法經
Fa-chi tsa-chi-ming 法集雜記銘
Fa-hsiang 法香
Fa-hsien 法顯
Fa-hsing 法性
Fa-li 法力
Fan-chen 范鎮
fang-teng-che ta-sheng chih t'ung-ming 方等者大乘之通名
fang-teng ta-tien 方等大典
Fan-i li 翻譯歷
Fan-wang ching 梵網經
Fa-ta 法達
Fa-tsang pu 法藏部
Fa-ying 法穎
Fa-yin ssu 法音寺
Fa-yüan tsa-yüan yüan-shih chi 法苑雜緣原始集
Fei Ch'ang-fang 費長房
Fo i i-yin yen-shuo fa chung-sheng sui-lei k'o te chieh 佛以一音演說法衆生隨類可得解
Fo-kuo-p'in 佛國品
fu-hsing 復興
Go-kan yori sō sai ni itaru yakkyō soroku 後漢より宋齊に至る譯經總錄
han-shih 含識
Han wei liang-chin nan-pei-ch'ao fo-chiao shih 漢魏兩晉南北朝佛教史
Hayashiya Tomojirō 林屋友次郎
ho (*āya) 合
Ho-li-pa-mo 訶梨跋摩
Hsiang-ch'eng 項城
hsiang-chiao 像教
hsiang-fa 像法
Hsiao-ching 孝經
Hsia-p'ei 下邳
Hsi Ch'ao 郗超
Hsieh Ling-yün 謝靈運
Hsien yü ching chi 賢愚經記
hsing erh shang 形而上
Hsin-t'ing ssu 新亭寺
Hsüan-ch'ang 玄暢
hsüan chih yu hsüan 玄之又玄
hsüan-hsüeh 玄學
Hsüan-kao 玄高
hsüan ning 玄凝
hsü-chi 虛寂
Hsü Hsün Hsü kao-seng chuan 許詢 許高僧傳
hua 化
Hua-ti pu 化地部
hua-t'ung 化通
Hui-chi 暉珠
Hui-chiao 慧皎
Hui-k'uo 慧廓
Hui-yüan 慧遠
Hung-ming chi 弘明集
i 義
I-ch'ieh-yu pu 一切有部
i-ch'u 譯出
i-huo 疑惑
i-k'ung chih men 義空之門
i-li 義理
I-pu tsung lun lun 異部宗輪論
I-t'ung san-ssu 儀同三司
i-yeh 依業
i-yin chen-pien ying hu ch'ün-yu chih ching 一音振辯應乎群有之境
K'ai-shan lu 開善路
K'ai-shan ssu 開善寺

kan-chao 感照
K'ang Seng-hui 康僧會
kan-ying 感應
Kao-seng chuan 高僧傳
Kao Ssu-sun 高似孫
k'u (duhkha) 苦
kuan-chung i-ching lu 關中異經錄
Kuang-chai 光宅
Kuang hung-ming chi 廣弘明集
Ku hsiao-shuo kou-ch'en 古小說鉤沈
Ku i-ching lu 古異經錄
li ("cosmic order"; I-ching) 理
li 禮
Liang 良
Liang-chou 涼州
Liang-shu 梁書
Liang-t'u i-ching lu 涼土異經錄
li-hsing ch'ü-chih tung yü huan-t'ung shih wei tso-wang 離形去智洞於化通是為坐忘
li-kan 理感
Lin-ch'üan wang hung 臨川王宏
ling-chin 靈津
ling-lü 靈律
Li-tai san-pao chi 歷代三寶記
Liu Hsieh 劉勰
Liu I-min 劉遺民
liu-tu 六度
Liu Yü 劉裕
lo (sukha) 樂
Lü-chi 律記
Lu Hsün 魯迅
lun 論
Lu-shan 廬山
Ming-seng chuan 名僧傳
Nan-ch'i shu 南齊書
Nan-p'ing wang wei 南平王偉
Nan-shih 南史
Neng-jen 能仁
Ning-chih 凝知
Pa-ling wang 巴陵王
pan-che-yü-se (pañcavarsika) 般遮于瑟
Pao-ch'ang 寶唱
pa-wan-ssu-ch'ien fa-yün 八萬四千法蘊
P'eng-ch'eng 彭城
pieh-sheng 別生
p'ien 偏 variant for pien 遍
p'ing-teng 平等
p'i-yeh 毘耶
pu-ching (aśuddhā) 不淨
San-pao chi; see li-tai san-pao chi
Sa-p'o-tuo-pu chi 薩婆多部記
Seng-chao 僧肇
Seng-cheng 僧正
seng-chu 僧主
Seng-fan 僧範
Seng-kuan 僧觀
Seng-pao 僧寶
Seng-yeh 僧業
Shaku Dōan kenkyū 釋道安研究
Sha-na 剎那
Shan-hsien 剡縣
Shan-lu 剡錄
Shao-wu hsü-shih ts'ung-shu 邵武徐氏叢書
sheng-pin 勝負
Shen-mieh lun 神滅論
She-shan 攝山
she-shen (*adhyātma-tyāga) 捨身
Shih-chiao lu; see K'ai-yüan shih-chiao lu 開元釋教錄
Shih-chia p'u 釋迦譜
Shih-chieh chi 世界記
Shih-chieh chi chi 世界集記
Shih-erh pu ching 十二部經
Shih-erh wei pu 十二偽部
shih-hui 事會
Shih-i lu 失譯錄
Shih Seng-sh'en 釋僧審
Shih Seng-yu 釋僧祐
Shih-shuo hsin-yü 世說新語
Shih-sung 十誦
Shih-sung i-chi 十誦義集
Shih Tao-an 釋道安
shih-tzu 師資
shou-chü-chieh 受具戒
Shou-leng-yen san-mei ching 首楞嚴三昧經
shu erh pu tso 述而不作
Ssu-pu yao-lüeh 四部要略
Ssu-shih-erh chang ching 四十二章經
ssu-t'u 司徒
Sun-ch'o 孫綽
Sun Ch'üan 孫權
su-ti 俗諦
Ta-chung pu 大衆部
Ta fang-teng ta-chi ching 大方等大集經
t'ai-fu 太傅
Tai-shan 岱山
Ta-lü-t'an ching 大樓炭經
T'an Cheng-pi 譚正璧
T'ang Yung-t'ung 湯用彤
tao 道
tao-chi-che 道極者
Tao-hsüan 道宣
Tao-lin 道林
tao-te 道德
Ta-t'ang nei-tien lu 大唐內典錄
Ta-t'ien (Mahādeva) 大天
T'i 提
T'ien-t'ai 天台
Tīng 庭
Tīng 丁
Ting-lin ssu 定林寺
Tokiwa Daijō 常盤大定
Tsa-lu 雜錄
Tsa-pei chi 雜碑記

tsung-chi 宗極
Tsung-li chung-ching mu-lu 綜理衆經目錄
T'ung-shan 銅山
Tung-shan seng-chuan 東山僧傳
Tung-huang 敦煌
tzu fo chi-yu a-nan so-ch'uan fen wei san-tsang 自佛卽幽阿難所傳分為三藏
tzu-jan 自然
Ui Hakuju 宇井伯壽
wei-tao (Bodhi) 為道
wei-wang 僞妄
Wen-hsin tiao-lung 文心雕龍
Wen-hsüan wang 文宣王
Ying-chen (Arhat) 應真
Yin-kuang pu 飲光部
yu 有
Yü 俞
Yüan (pratyaya) 緣
Yüan Ang 袁昂
yüan-chi (1st ch. CST) 緣記
yüan-chi 緣機
yu-chih 幽旨
yu-ch'ing 有情
yu-hsin 有心
yü-hsuan 玉媛
Yung-k'ang 永康
Yü-t'ien (Khotan) 于闐
Wen-shu 文殊
wu ("nonexistence") 無
Wu 吳
wu-ch'ang (anitya) 無常
Wu-che ta-hui 無遮大會
wu-chung 五衆
wu-nien i-ch'ieh ta-chung hui 五年一切大衆會
wu-pu 五部
wu-shih 五事
Wu wen fo-chih hsü-chi fei ming-hsiang so-i shen-ch'eng miao-chüeh 吾聞佛旨虛寂非名相所議神涅妙絕
wu-wo (anātman) 無我
Yen Fo-t'iao 嚴佛調
yin (hetu) 因

BRIEF COMMUNICATIONS

Rejoinder to W. Eberhard's Review

W. Eberhard von der University of California macht an der genannten *Symbolik des chinesischen Universismus* einige Ausstellungen [J. A. O. S., LXXIX (1959), 64-65], die vom Text des Buches her gesehen frei erfunden sind.

Der Rezensent kritisiert zunächst, daß "no attempt to differentiate between old and recent symbols" gemacht worden sei. Ausschließlich und *ausdrücklich* handelt das Buch aber nur von *alten* Symbolen; siehe die Liste sämtlicher behandelter Symbole auf S. 101 f. Schon das *Thema* verlangte ja die Beschränkung auf alte Symbole. Daß der Autor ferner nicht die Enwickelung der Symbole verfolgen wollte, hat er expressis verbis (S. 12 f.) zu verstehen gegeben. Es wurde ja auch schon so der vom Verlag und Herausgeber zur Verfügung gestellte Raum über einen Bogen hinaus überschritten. Trotzdem hat der Autor oft genug auf Entwickelungen kurz hingewiesen, wenn sie für Leser, die an allgemeiner Religionsgeschichte interessiert sind und für die das Buch ja geschrieben wurde, verständlich und einsichtig waren.

Zweitens kritisiert der Rezensent daß vom Autor "no recent study by Chinese or Japanese scholars has been used." Der Autor hat aber wohl ein ziemlich eingehendes Studium von "recent Chinese or Japanese scholars" betrieben. Nur hat er dabei feststellen müssen, daß außer bloßen Identifizierungen und Beschreibungen von bloßen Formen—die ja ausdrücklich (S. 12) auch schon wegen Platzmangels ausgeschlossen wurden—keinerlei Beitrag zu finden war, der über Symbole in dem philosophischen Sinne, wie der Autor ihn braucht, handelte. Der Rezensent ist hiermit gebeten, aus seinem angeblichen Wissen von neueren Arbeiten konkrete Veröffentlichungen zu nennen! Der Autor berichtigt sich dann nur allzu gern und weiß ihm mit allen Lesern Dank. Dabei möge aber der Rezensent nicht übersehen, daß in dem Buche zum *ersten Male* in der Sinologie vom Symbol in jenem unfassenden und philosophischen Sinne gehandelt wird, wie ihn der Philosoph Cassirer uns ja überhaupt erst zu Bewußtsein gebracht hat. Der Rezensent übersieht das wohl um so leichter, als er, nach seinen Werken zu urteilen, wohl eine Ideologie, aber keine Philosophie hat. Ein über einige soziale Tatsachen oberflächlich konstruierter ideologischer Überbau ist aber bei weitem noch keine Philosophie!

Drittens bekrittelt der Rezensent, daß "no new interpretations of texts has been made." Auch das ist falsch. Abgesehen davon, daß es nicht auf neue, sondern richtige Übersetzungen ankommt, sei hier nur auf eines hingewiesen: Dem Rezententen entgeht nämlich ganz, welch weitreichende Umwälzungen in der Deutung der Klassiker und Philosophen sich ergeben, wenn die vom Autor aufgestellte und eingehend begründete Deutung von li als Tradition (S. 68-73) richtig durchgeführt wird! Das wird noch deutlicher werden, wenn man die auf das Buch über "Symbolik" gefolgte (Sinologica [VI, 1] Basel 1959, 57 ff.) und die noch folgenden größeren Publikationen des Autors liest.

Der vierte Vorwurf, die "ideas of Chinese philosophers are disregarded," ist so haltlos, daß einer nur ehrlich das Buch selbst zu lesen braucht, um zu sehen, wie der Autor sich ständig auf Philosophen wie Chaung-tzu, Lao-tzu, Konfuzius, Meng-tzu, Hsün-tzu u. a. beruft und sie mit Fleiß heranzieht. Von seinen chinesischen Freunden, darunter international bekannt Sinologen, wurde dem Autor allzeit eher ein zu großer Respekt den chinesischen Philosophen gegenüber vorgehalten!

Allein aus der Richtigstellung dieser willkürlichen Behauptungen wird klar, wie grundlos und falsch der abschließende Satz des Rezensenten ist, daß das Buch "at best the status of knowledge around 1930" Gäbe. In diesem vom Rezensenten mit Emphase hingestellten Satz leistet der Rezensent sich einen geradezu univerständlichen "disregard" der eindrucksvollen Arbeiten von so verdienten Forschern auf sinologischem Gebiete wie: Schuyler Cammann, A. Waley, A. Wright, Tjan Tjoe Som, Hellmut Wilhelm, B. Karlgren, M. Kaltenmark u. a., die samt und sonders erst nach 1930, in der Hauptsache aber zwischen 1940-1956 publiziert haben. Die genannten Autoren erwähnt

der Autor in seinem Buche mit Fleiß und Hochachtung, nur hier und da ergänzend und richtigstellend. Sind die Arbeiten dieser hochverdienten Forscher aus den letzten 10-15 Jahren in den Augen des Rezensenten sinn- und wertlos? Ferner dürfte bei einer aufmerksamen Lektüre der Ss. 53-73 klar werden, wie viel grundlegender als mit der vom Rezensenten vorgetragenen, aber überstrapazierten gentry-Idee, die altchinesische Gesellschaft erklärt wird durch die im Bach vom Autor vorgetragene möglichst umfassende Beachtung der tsung-Idee, vorab ihrer religiösen Wurzel Ss. 53-65. Weiterhin hat ein jüngerer, aber kritischerer Forscher, der französische Sinologe M. Kaltenmark, in der "Revue de l'Histoire des Religions" (Paris, avril-juin 1958, 256 f.) ehrlich zugegeben, wie neu und interessant ihm die Aufstellung des Entsprechens als Grundbegriff der chinesischen Kultur ist; siehe auch das kleine Büchlein: H. Köster, *Über eine Grundidee der chinesischen Kultur* (Kaldenkirchen, Rhld. 1957). Der Rezensent *verschweigt ganz*, wie der Autor in der "Symbolik" das Entsprechen als Grundidee der chinesischen Kultur betont! Doch dürfte objektiven Lesern des Buches klar werden, wie weit tiefer das Entsprechen als Schlüssel zur chinesischen Kulturgeschichte dringt, als die gentry-Idee des Rezensenten. Um des Entlarvens all der Mut- (oder gar Bös-?) willigkeiten des Rezensenten ein Ende zu machen, sei noch gefragt, wo findet der Rezensent für Interessenten der allgemeinen Religions- und Geistesgeschichte in der neueren und neuesten sinologischen Literatur (1.) die Bedeutung der Töpferscheibe für das altchinesische Denken so betont wie auf den Ss. 19 f. u. 52 des Buches?; wo (2.) die Korrektur am Gerede von der chinesischen Geomantik (S. 50)? wo (3.) die ziemlich unfassende Darstellung der Symbolik von der Ehe, 57 ff.? wo (4.) die Symbolik des Spiegels, 62 ff. und 94 ff.?—der so interessante Aufsatz von Demiéville, Le mirroir spirituel, in Sinologica (I, 2) Basel 1947, 112-137, behandelt doch ausdrücklich und hauptsächlich die Symbolik des Spiegels im Buddhismus, der im Buche des Autors ja ausgeschlossen war!—wo (5.) die Symbolik und den Begriff der "Unsterblichkeit," 88 ff.? wo (6.) die Symbolik der te wie auf den Ss. 22 f., 76 f. and 83 f.? wo (7.) die ins Einzelne gehende Darstellung der chinesischen Bezeichnungen für Symbol wie auf den Ss. 20 ff.? und schließlich (8.) die durch das ganze Buch sich hinziehende Aufdeckung der religiösen Fundamente der altchinesischen Kultur?

HERMANN KÖSTER

Surrejoinder

A comparison of the *Symbolik* with the work of such men as D. Bodde or Schuyler Camman (both attacked on p. 17, p. 11 *et al.*), Feng Yu-lan, Ch'ien Mu or Chan Wing-tsit, or with such books as *Studies in Chinese Thought* and *Chinese Thought and Institutions* as to the level of sophistication and the level of interpretation of texts will make the remark about "the status of knowledge" clear.

One more point "das Entsprechen als Grundidee" has been discussed by A. Forke (1927), myself (1933) and many others.

W. EBERHARD

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Akten des vierundzwanzigsten Internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses München (28. August bis 4. September 1957). Herausgegeben von HERBERT FRANKE. Pp. xii + 776. Wiesbaden: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft e. V. in Kommission bei FRANZ STEINER VERLAG GMBH, 1959.

A review of a book of this size and heterogeneity is likely to degenerate into a mere listing of the papers and abstracts or, contrarily, into glorification of some authors and vilification of others. In any case a review tells us almost inevitably more about the reviewer than about the book. I should not like to leave you without some idea of the contents (and particularly its range of contents) nor shall I try to eclipse my own personality by suppressing some thoughts that are aroused—or revoked—by the articles I have read.

First of all, Dr. Herbert Franke, the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, the Franz Steiner Verlag of Wiesbaden, and the Wiesbadener Graphische Betriebe are to be congratulated by anyone aware of the pitfalls provided by the languages, literatures, and archeological, religious, artistic, historical, social, and (peripherally) the economic experience of the overwhelming mass of mankind and the irrevocable preponderance of values throughout history and beyond into prehistory. Their several tasks have not been light and there is no indication that the task is going to prove easier at the next or subsequent Congresses.

Second, Dr. Ernst Waldschmidt's opening address touched on some enduring problems that deserve careful consideration at the coming Congress in the Soviet Union. One of these is the dilemma always faced in major international congresses: Shall cross-fertilization be almost completely stopped or shall a brake be placed on splintering and specialization by sections? A congress misses an essential part of its purpose if a member spends all his time in his specialty. Highly specialized communications can be disseminated worldwide within the profession or branch or section or nook by the printed page much more adequately than by oral delivery unless ample time for formal and informal discussion is provided. Dr. Waldschmidt has put it very well: "Den Kongreßbesuchern soll neben der Anregung auf eigenem Fachgebiet ja auch die Möglichkeit geboten werden, die Zäune des Faches zu überspringen, Kollegen aus andern Gebieten Auge in Auge gegenüberzutreten, sie persönlich zu hören und, wo erwünscht, mit ihnen Fühlung aufzunehmen." (p. 29) Dr. Waldschmidt's predecessors have generally mentioned this problem, but little has been done about it.

Ministerialdirektor Professor Dr. Paul Egon Hübinger was lyric in his depiction of the Oriental Congresses, of Germany's old-yet-ever-new role in Oriental studies, and of the future possibilities of those studies. The very fact of Germany's late colonial marriage (and early divorcement!) has enabled her to become less involved emotionally and politically than most great powers in the Afro-Asian storms of recent years. Germany's role in "Occidental" studies, especially in Central and Eastern Europe, has been more like that of the colonial powers, and Germany has suffered some of the same disabilities and acquired some of the same opprobrium. The onus of earlier expansionist policies becomes especially burdensome when contraction sets in. Americans now deserve to bear in mind the experiences of the Germans, Russians, British, French, Dutch, Swedes, and almost everybody else. We are riding high. Outright military aggression is not the only kind that impedes seeing straight or that precludes an ennobling *Fühlungnahme*.

Pages 38-41 contain the Resolutions drawn up by the various Sections and approved by the Plenum. Reference is also made to the Koreanist's lone dissenting vote to being placed in a section with Japanologists if the present broader category is abolished.

The volume ends with a list of the members or participants and the titles of their papers, whether published *in extenso*, in abstract, or listed by title only due to the absence of an MS.

Third, before turning to the Sections I should like to touch on a problem that is being swept

under the rug at major international congresses: the matter of official or permitted languages. There was a time when Latin was not only the international, but also the universal language of learning as long as the "universe" was Catholic Europe. With the breach in that unity Latin declined. For two or three centuries French was widely used as the international language at parleys and congresses without arousing too much animosity. With the growth of national atomism, especially since World War I, French has lost her primacy. English is now dominant in worldwide meetings, though French, German, Spanish, or Russian can claim priority in regional conferences. There is no telling where—or how soon—this drift toward multilingual chaos may take us. There will certainly be a fourth official language at the XXVth Congress. Fairly soon a situation may develop where an invitation to meet in Bangkok or Djakarta will be voted down by the members of the Congress because it would add one more official language to our burden.

The Statutes drawn up by the Eleventh Congress in Paris in 1897 provided in IV:

"Le Comité d'organisation désignera, parmi les langues du pays où le Congrès se tiendra, une ou plusieurs langues qui seront la langue ou les langues officielles du Congrès, et que l'on emploiera à la rédaction des procès-verbaux des séances.

"L'usage d'autres langues sera facultatif dans la discussion, sous la responsabilité du président de chaque section."

To deny Russian the status of an "international language" at an Oriental congress is without foundation. The Russian contribution to Oriental studies is an honored one and there is no reason to expect it to lessen in the future. The increasing number of scholars who now use Russian as their first "second language" vitiates the lack-of-internationality argument. Particularly the number of young scholars who learn Russian before English, French, or German is bound to defecundate Oriental studies if their contributions are withheld from the marketplace of ideas until these same discoveries are remade by those who have acquired French, German, or English as their second language the paper is in (for the paper can always be guage. It is not so much a question of the lantranslated and disseminated before or at the time of reading) as of the languages admitted in the discussion following presentation. Scholars hesitate to discuss what they may only vaguely have understood and they will certainly be reluctant to enter a free-for-all if they have to spend more time fumbling for words in a permitted language than for ideas in an exploratory process. There are few scholars even now who can hold their own in trilingual debate and they are mostly from Holland, Sweden, and such other countries as are divinely favored with languages of minimum utility abroad.

The official languages at the Congress of 1889 (Stockholm and Christiania) were: "French, German, English, Italian, Latin, and the Oriental languages." At Paris in 1928 they were French, English, Italian, and German. Professor Abdur-Rahman delivered a paper in Arabic, but it seems not to have been discussed. At Brussels in 1938 French, English, Italian, and German were used. At Paris in 1948: French, English, and Italian only. At Istanbul in 1951: English, German, and French. At Cambridge in 1954: English, French, German, and Russian. Statistics have not been provided in the published *Proceedings* of these congresses that would enable us to reach any conclusions as to the degree of comprehending participation in the various official languages. Statistics on absenteeism and vacant staring into space or doodling are not published. Nor is there any indication of the degree of effort by speakers in their mother tongue to articulate clearly for the benefit of those born to "lesser" languages. The French are not such great offenders in this respect as the native speakers of English, who seem to forget not only all speakers of foreign languages but all speakers of English of a noticeably different brand.

The one indication given of an awareness of this problem was by Werner Vycichl of Paris who at Munich read his paper in *Standard-Deutsch*.[1] This attitude should spread to all users of their own or a second language at Congresses.

---

[1] "Der Vortrag wurde in Standard-Deutsch gehalten. Standard-Deutsch ist normales, korrektes Deutsch, keine Basic-Sprache. Es ist die passende Form für technische und wissenschaftliche Literatur. Es besteht a) aus einem Minimal-Vokabular deutscher Wörter und b) der gesamten internationalen Terminologie für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik. Lange Wörter werden getrennt. Wenn nötig, werden einzelne Wörter erklärt. Die Syntax ist einfach: keine langen Inversionen und keine komplizierten Perioden. Daher ist Standard-Deutsch leicht zu lesen, besonders für Nicht-Deutsche."

The basic problem has not been resolved by self-imposed clarity of articulation in five to seven languages. Spanish, Italian, Arabic, and Chinese are sure to claim *de jure* and *de facto* Congress recognition very soon. There is no reason to expect Hindi and Malay/Indonesian to remain on the sidelines as soon as these languages have brought their scientific lexicons up to date. Morphologically and syntactically they are superior to a number of languages now permitted. Those who insist most firmly that the Congress language problem is not a serious one are the very persons who speak their own language at such congresses and fail to understand much of what is said (and often what is written as well) in one or both of the other two "universal languages." It is time to face this problem squarely in a spirit of international interest, not ethnic, religious, or racial pride.

There are two languages in the Latin-descended tradition which have great numbers of native speakers and the certain prospect of great demographic growth and yet which have had worldwide contact with a minimum of present-day colonialist opprobrium: Spanish and Portuguese. Portugal still has an empire (though held with a minimum of strain) and Portuguese is orthoepically not the easiest language to handle, so it had perhaps better yield to Spanish. No one nowadays is afraid of Spanish aggression; everyone is aware that Spanish has had prolonged contact with Asian, African, and American Indian civilizations and cultures. Spanish had continual contact with Islamic civilization for an extended period and made major contributions to it (if we may be forgiven for glottomorphicizing man for a moment!). All are aware of the Arabic and Islamic component of Spanish. Spanish has a closer correspondence between sound and symbol than any of the traditional three. It is a language of a rich literary tradition. It has also been much more of an international language than most English-French-German advocates realize. It could be elevated to juridical status with less linguistic tinkering and fewer national fears and jealousies than any candidate now on the horizon. It is true that Spanish pronunciation is less monolithic than French, its grammatical complexity greater than German, its lexical adaptability inferior to English. On the other hand, the Spanish phonemic system is such that fewer misunderstandings would result from phonemic substitution than in any of the major contenders for the job. If the corresponding stops were substituted for the intervocalic fricatives [~~b~~, ~~d~~, ~~g~~], no semantic confusion would result. If [s] were substituted for [θ] of the Castilian pronunciation, no more ambiguity would result than now occurs throughout Hispanic America. Even the substitution of [z] for [s] or of [s] for the allophone [z] would create no problems as it surely would in French or English or even German. [h] for [x] would remain unambiguous and intelligible. Five vowels without need for distinguishing quantity, accent marks for stress except when it falls on carefully specified syllables, minimum obscuration of vowel quality when unstressed: these are linguistic plusses of no mean importance when discussing the use of Spanish by the people of the whole world as a second language.

The purely political factor of votes-in-the-Assembly should not be permitted to override weightier considerations, but it might well be used in support. At least nineteen nations have Spanish as the official language and a number of others (including the Portuguese-speaking nations) and former Spanish colonies which have other languages as official still retain considerable affinity with Spanish or have felt Spanish influence.

[Perhaps the reviewer should show his objectivity by revealing that he has no Spanish blood, is not a Catholic, and has a comfortably better speaking knowledge of English, German, French, Dutch, Polish, and Russian than he has of Spanish. The inertial comfort of any one individual or nation cannot be a determining factor here where the common weal of all attempting to engage in cultural exchange is at stake.]

These gratuitous remarks in the form of an excursus from the review at hand were intended to provoke thought and elicit arguments for or against a single language as the least common denominator of scholarly discourse. We are—or should be—tired of *argumenta ad inertiam*, for these can only lead to deeper and more irremediable chaos. Fifteen years (or five congresses) should allow ample time for participants to acquire or deepen their knowledge of the single, agreed-upon international language. In the meantime we may continue pretending that sixty percent of the members understand everything that is being said in French, English, German, Russian, and such other languages as may foist themselves upon such a Congress as ours.

Let us now return from the latent, general possibilities for weal or woe to the patent, specific black-on-white words of scholars in the fourteen sections, beginning with Egyptology.

I: Egyptologie

The notation "Kein Manuskript eingegangen" here and in most of the sections indicates one of the most pressing problems facing the editor of the *Proceedings*. A compromise had to be struck by him between omitting a great share of the papers and publishing more or less on time, and publishing all the papers shortly after the first Greek calends.

An idea of the range within this section is given by three of the titles: *Die Parallel-Entwicklung der drei alten Schrift-Urschöpfungen (Ägyptische Schrift, Keilschrift, chinesische Schrift)*, *Der wirtschaftliche und kulturelle gegenseitige Einfluss Ägyptens und seiner Nachbarländer im II.-I. Jahrtausend vor unserer Zeitrechnung*, and *Où en est la vocalisation de l'égyptien?*

IIa: Assyriologie

A variegated sample here might include *Flüchtlinge in Ugarit*, *Unpublished Works of Ancient Near Eastern Art in North American Collections*, *A propos du syllabaire sumérien*, *Fortschritte der Erforschung des Urartu-Reichs*, *Drives, Motives and Values: Some Psychological Aspects of Sumerian Culture*, and *Gab es ein Esel-Nomadentum im Alten Orient?*

IIb: Kleinasienforschung

Hauptprobleme der hethitischen Geographie, *Tešup-Japetos (-te) Equation According to Old Armenian Historical Tradition*, *Phrygian Archaeology in the Light of the New Gordian Excavations*, *Anatolisch und Ägäisch*, *Etudes de l'épigraphie ourartoue et certaines questions de l'histoire d'Ourartou* are titles that reveal the range here.

III: Altes Testament, biblische Archäologie und Judaica

The Tree of Life, the Hebrew relative clause, the Khirbet Qumran texts, the century-old alleged Firkowicz falsifications, Hebraica collections in the USSR, *'am hā 'āreṣ* (the People of the Land), Psalm 45 (44), the Greek equivalents of *schadad* and *schaddaj*, and inscribed jar handles from Gibeon all come in for treatment.

IV: Christlicher Orient und Byzanz

One of the most interesting of all the sections for a non-specialist in the field is undoubtedly this one. The very fact that this area largely escaped the Renaissance and the Reformation has relegated it in the minds of West and Central Europeans to a negligible status. The West tended to ignore the East, the all-too-near East, which was neither Arabic nor Turkish in language nor Islamic in religion. There is a growing tendency today to try to view all Eastern Europe through Russian eyes. The truth is much more complicated now as then. The Near East was never exclusively Islamic nor is the eastern tier of states completely Russified or Communist. I should be the last to deny the importance of the Islamic contribution to the Near East or the Russian or Soviet influence on East Europe today, yet nothing is less monolithic than this East European and Near Eastern area. This is a cultural fault along which most of the political, cultural, and economic quakes are likely to occur. In a few instances religious symbiosis of a peculiar sort developed. The paper entitled *Die griechische Insel Syros in ethnischer and religiöser Hinsicht in der byzantinischen und neueren Zeit* (p. 216-219) deals with such a case. *Der Mani-Fund* is another matter of intersectional Oriental interest.

V: Semitistik

Aramaic is dealt with in two papers: *Une stèle araméenne inédite de Sfiré (Syrie) du VIII^e siècle avant J.-C.* and *Unité et variété des dialectes araméens anciens.* Some fundamental questions are discussed in *What is a Semitic Language? A Problem of Linguistic Identification* and *Who were the Semites?* A number of other papers deal with the classification of particular Semitic languages. Human sacrifices in pre-Islamic days and clero-mantic practices, or, more specifically, belomantic practices at the pre-Islamic Ka'ba were discussed. There were several grammatical studies, a toponomastic one of non-Arabic names in Central South Arabia, and a numismatic one of the Qatabanite kingdom. One of the grammatical papers whose import extends beyond Semitic is entitled: *Tempus und Modus im Semitischen.*

VI: Islamwissenschaften: Sprache- und Literaturwissenschaft

The first papers in this chapter illustrate again how persistent is our uncertainty about basic matters in a religion "born in the full light of day." Take these as specimens: *Zum Problem der Datierung der ältesten Koran-Handschriften, The Mysterious Letters in the Qur'ān,* and *Une œuvre mu'tazilite inédite: le Muġnī du Qāḍī 'Abd al-Ǧabbār.*

The Translations of al-Biṭrīq and Yaḥyā (Yuḥannā) b. al-Biṭrīq discusses their roles as translators, including their partial eclipse by Ḥunain b. Isḥāq and his school.

The account of the founding by the Arab League of the *Institute des Manuscrits Arabes* and its activities will be of interest to all. The Institute has undertaken to microfilm and bring under one roof reproductions of the greatest possible number of Arabic MSS of importance because of their intrinsic value or rarity. These MSS are now scattered throughout the world and many of them are very difficult of access. The film library will be kept in Cairo and made available for consultation by scholars of all countries. Prints will be provided at moderate prices for personal or institutional use. It is further proposed to prepare a catalogue of hitherto noninventoried MSS and give their location. A third aim is to publish the MSS of particular importance A fourth is to provide a center for collaboration between scholars and scientific institutions of the whole world to facilitate knowledge of these MSS and the exchange of information concerning them.

VII: Islamwissenschaften: Religion, Geschichte und Kunst[2]

Sobhi Labib (Harburg): *Geld und Kredit. Studien zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte Ägyptens im Mittelalter.*

André Raymond (Paris): *Le Muḥtasib au Caire au XVIII^e siècle.* (KME)

Claude Cahen (Strasbourg): *Quelques considérations sur l'histoire des villes musulmanes au Moyen-Age.*

David Ayalon (Jerusalem): *The Mamluks* and *Sea Power—A Phase in the Struggle between Islam and European Christendom.* (KME)

M. S. Khan (Calcutta): *The Eye-Witness Reporters of Miskawaih's Contemporary History.*

Felix Tauer (Prague/Praha): *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Geschichtswerke Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrūs.*

Ignace Abdo Khalife (Beirut/Beyrouth): *Un nouveau traité mystique d'Ibn Ḫaldūn.*

Walter Fischel (Berkeley): *Ibn Khaldūn's Contribution to Comparative Religions.*

M. Anwarud Haq (Madras): *Influence of Muslim Political Thought on Medieval European Political Thought.*

J.-M. Abd-El-Jalil (Paris): *L'autocritique dans l'islam actuel.*

Omeljan Pritsak (Hamburg): *Die Herkunft der Seldschuken.* (KME)

A. Ali-Zade (Moscow): *The Agrarian system in Azerbaijan in the XIII-XIV Centuries.*

Janine Sourdel-Thomine (Paris): *Les décors de stuc dans l'est iranien à l'époque salǧūqide.*

Oktay Aslanapa (*Istanbul*): *Täbriser Künstler am Hofe der osmanischen Sultane in Istanbul.*

Emir Maurice Chehab (Beirut/Beyrouth): *Découverte d'un palais omeyyade à 'Andjar (Liban).*

Abbas Mazda (Teheran): *Archaeological History of Iranian Antique Glass from 1500 B.C. to 1500 A.D.* (KME)

M. A. Marzouk (Sidi Gaber): *The Earliest Fatimid Textile.*

S. D. Goitein (Jerusalem): *Present State and Problems of the Philological and Historical Research on the Cairo Geniza.*

Fehim Bajraktarevic (Belgrade): *Das orientalische Kulturerbe bei den Südslawen.* (KME)

Muhammed Hamidullah (Paris): *Ästhetik und Kunst in der Lehre des Propheten.*

Tadeusz Lewicki (Cracow/Kraków): *Les Ibāḍites dans l'Arabie du sud au moyen-âge.*

Saleh Ahmad El Ali (Baghdad): *Large Estates in Hijaz During the 1st Century A.H.*

E. A. Beljaev (Moscow/Moskva): *On the Question of the Causes of Sectarian Movements in Islam.*

Kurt Erdmann (Istanbul): *Anatolien, ein Neuland der islamischen Kunstgeschichte.* [Allgemeiner Vortrag für alle Sektionen.]

[2] Because of the inordinate length of this review and the excursus on the official-language problem it seems desirable for the second half of the work to resort to listing selected titles with the notation KME (for *Kein Manuskript eingegangen*), where applicable. The titles are selected for the range of subject matter, not for magnitude of scholarly contribution. Only a specialist in each field could determine that unerringly.

VIII: Turkologie

Julius Németh (Budapest): *Spuren der türkischen Sprache in Albanien.*

İsmail Hikmet Ertaylan (Istanbul/İstanbul): *Le poète tchagataien Yūsuf Emīrī et deux manuscrits de la bibliothèque de l'Université d'Istanbul.*

Pertev Naili Boratav (Paris): *Vestiges oğuz dans la tradition bektaşi.*

Robert Mantran (Tunis): *La titulature des Beys de Tunis au XIX^e siècle d'après les documents d'archives turcs du Dar el-Bey (Tunis).*

Ahmet Hamdi Tanpinar (Istanbul): *Essai d'interprétation des images de la vieille poésie amoureuse.*

A. S. Tveritinova (Moscow): *The Turkish Manuscript of Qoğa Ḥusejn's Chronicle Bedā'i' ül-weqā'i'.*

Jean Deny (Gérardmer): *Persan lävänd dans l'usage osmanli.*

Reşid Rahmeti Arat (Istanbul): *Über die Entwicklungsperioden der türkischen Schriftsprache.*

Ananiasz Zajączkowski (Warsaw/Warszawa): *Die früheste türkische Version des Werkes Ḫusrev u Šīrīn von Qutb.*

Bekir Sıtkı Baykal (Ankara): *Die Frage der Heiligen Stätten und die Hohe Pforte.*

René Giraud (Ankara): *L'expressivité dans le turc parlé.*

Tevfik Biyiklioğlu (Ankara): *Zwei englische und zwei türkische bisher unveröffentlichte Urkunden zum Waffenstillstand von Mudros* (30. X. 1918).

IX: Iran, Kaukasus und Nachbargebiete

Said Naficy (Aligarh): *Etat actuel des études sur le Pahlavi en Iran.*

Erwad Peshotan Anklesaria (London): *The Importance of Work among the Private Libraries of the Parsis.*

Helmuth Scheel (Mainz/Mayence): *Iranische Turfanica.*

G. Redard (Bern/Berne): *Projet d'un Atlas Linguistique de l'Iran.*

'Abd-ul-Ghafūr Ravān Farhādī (Kabul): *Notes sur le tableau des langues actuellement parlées en Afghanistan.*

Werner Winter (Austin, Texas): *Some Remarks on a Plan for a Repertory of Armenian Etymology.*

Gul-Pača Ulfat (Kabul): *Aims and Activities of Pashtō Tōlana (The Pashtō Academy).*

A. M. Mirzoev (Moscow): *About the Author of the Shāhanshāh Nāma.*

Muhammad Bāqīr (Lahore): *Iranian Lexicography with Special Reference to Madār-ol-Afāẕel, an Unpublished Lexicon of the 16th Century.*

E. Yar-Shater (Teheran): *Preliminary Information on Shāhrūdī, the Iranian Dialect of Khalkhāl.*

Richard N. Frye (Cambridge, Mass.): *Historical Material from Middle Persian Inscriptions.*

Hansjakob Seiler (Hamburg): *Die Relativkonstruktionen im jüngeren Awesta.*

Lars-Ivar Ringbom (Åbo): *Zur Ikonographie der Göttin Ardvi Sura Anahita.*

George G. Cameron (Ann Arbor, Mich.): *Elamite Cuneiform Documents from Persepolis.*

Dastur Framroze A. Bode (Bombay): *The Concept of the Soul in the Avestan Writings.*

Carsten Colpe (Göttingen): *Werfen die neuen Funde vom Toten Meer Licht auf das Verhältnis von iranischer und jüdischer Religion?*

L. Vanden Berghe (Ghent): *Reconnaissance archéologique dans le Fārs méridional et au Lāristān.*

Mohammad Mokri (Paris): *L'idée de l'incarnation chez les Ahl-i-Ḥaqq.*

J. Braginskij (Moscow): *Zum Studium des Schaffens Kamol Hudshandis.*

Robert Göbl (Vienna): *Münzprägung und Außenpolitik des Sassanidenstaates under Šāpūr II.*

Ali Afghah (Teheran): *La renaissance des lettres en Iran.*

X: Indologie

C. E. Godakumbura (London): *The Buddha Image in Ceylon.*

Edward Conze (London): *The Buddha's Bodies in the Prajñāpāramitā.*

Bernfried Schlerath (Frankfurt/M.): *Die Komposition der vedischen Hymnen.*

Vittore Pisani (Milan): *Zur Vorgeschichte des Indo-Arischen.*

Alfred Master (London): *Marathi Inscriptions* 1060-1300 A. D.

George T. Artola (Madras): *A Dated Manuscript of the Pañcatantra of Vasubhāga.*

Pierre H. L. Eggermont (Hengelo): *The Origin of the Śaka Era.*

Ferdinand LESSING (Berkeley): *Self-Realization Through Self-Deification.*

Walter RUBEN (Berlin): *Über den Tattvopaplava siṃha des Jayarāśi Bhaṭṭa, eine agnostizistische Erkenntniskritik.*

S. K. H. Peter, Prinz von Griechenland und Dänemark (Kalimpong): *Das Ratha Jatra-Fest in Puri, Provinz Orissa (Indien).*

Klaus BRUHN (Hamburg): *Das Verhältnis von Form und Inhalt in der indischen Ikonographie.*

W. Norman BROWN (Philadelphia): *The Vasanta Vilāsa.*

Mircea ÉLIADE (Chicago): *Étude comparative sur le "Rope Trick."*

Arabinda BASU (Durham): *The Major Trend in Modern Indian Mysticism.*

Ganesh Dutt GAUR (London): *Folksongs of Kuru Pradesh.*

V. W. PARANJPE (Poona): *Analysis of Case Terminations in Sanskrit with Special Reference to the Sūtras of Pāṇini.*

T. MUKHERJEE (London): *The Origin of the Brajabuli Language.*

V. V. BALABUŠEVIČ (Moscow): *Some Problems of Soviet Indology.*

J. Duncan M. DERRET (London): *Developments in Hindu Law* 1955-56.

XI: ZENTRALASIEN UND ALTAISTIK

Sir Gerard CLAUSON (London): *The Earliest Turkish Loan-Words in Mongolian.*

A. TOPTCHIBACHY (Vanves): *Quelques noms russes d'origine altaïque* (KME).

[A discussion of the various kinds of Turco-Mongolian linguistic relations.]

Nicholas N. POPPE (Seattle, Wash.): *Zur Frage der Verwandtschaft der mongolischen und türkischen Sprachen.*

Sir Gerard CLAUSEN (London): *The Case for the Altaic Theory Examined.*

Saadet ÇAGATAY (Ankara): *Eine osttürkische Handschrift: Baytarat'ul-važih.*

E. A. VIRTANEN (Helsinki): *Internationale Bräuche im Jagdrecht der altaischen Völker.*

Mecdut MANSUROĞLU (Istanbul): *Über die Entwicklung einiger Nebensätze im Neutürkischen.*

C. S. MUNDY (Ankara): *Spelling and Pronounciation [sic] in Old Ottoman, with Particular Reference to a Verse in Suheyl u Nevbahar.*

Karl JAHN (Utrecht): *Zum Problem der mongolischen Eroberungen in Indien (13.-14. Jahrhundert).*

XII: OSTASIEN—A) CHINA

Heinrich HERRFAHRDT (Marburg/L.): *Das logische Subjekt im Chinesischen und Japanischen.*

Tsung-i JAO (Hong Kong): *Ch'u Tz'u and Archaeology.*

Homer H. DUBS (Oxford): *The Rise of Philosophy in China Before Confucius.*

Harry SIMON (Ashtead): *Some Remarks on the Verb-System in Standard Chinese.* (KME)

André WEDEMEYER (Leipzig): *Vom Yü-kung.*

Luther C. GOODRICH (New York): *Recent Discoveries at Ch'üan-chou (Zayton).*

Otto MAENCHEN-HELFEN (Berkeley): *A Chinese Bronze with Sarmatian Motives.*

Prince Ernst Aschwin LIPPE-BIESTERFELD (New York): *The Nanking Painters.*

H. G. CREEL (Chicago): *On the Origins of the Chinese Examination System.*

James LIU (Hong Kong): *Some Theories of Poetry of the Ch'ing Period.*

André G. HAUDRICOURT (Paris): *Classification des substrats linguistiques de la Chine centrale et méridionale.*

Walter SIMON (London): *A Note on Chinese Texts in Tibetan Transcription.*

Jitsuzō TAMURA (Kyoto): *The Civilization of the Liao Empire.*

Joseph NEEDHAM (Cambridge): *Celestial Globes, Armillary Spheres, and the Clock-Drive in Chinese Astronomy.*

A. C. SCOTT (Hong Kong): *Ch'ou chiao êrh: The Comic Roles of the Chinese Classical Theatre.*

L. I. DUMAN (Moscow): *On the Social and Economic System of China in Western Han Period (3rd Century B.C. to 1st Century A.D.).*

Hellmut WILHELM (Seattle, Wash.): *The Heresies of Ch'en Liang* (1143-1194).

Chao-ling FANG (Oxford): *Chinese Painting.*

XII: OSTASIEN—B) JAPAN UND KOREA

Donald H. SHIVELY (Berkeley): *The Theatre in the Culture of the Japanese Cities of the Seventeenth Century.* (KME)

D. E. MILLS (Buckhurst Hill, Essex): *Jātaka-*

Stories in Japanese Buddhist Tale-Collections of the Heian and Kamakura Periods.

Günther WENCK (Hamburg): *Die Wortspiele des Kinō wa kyō no monogatari* (KME).

Joachim GLAUBITZ (Hamburg): *Zur Textkritik am Hokke-hyakuza-kikigaki-shō.*

C. J. DUNN (London): *'Goes,' 'is going,' 'has gone,' 'went' in Modern Spoken Japanese.*

Shozen NAKAYAMA (Tenri): *On the Tenrikyō Doctrine.*

P. P. TOPECHA (Moscow): *Some Aspects of the Economic Background of the Meiji Revolution.*

André ECKARDT (Starnberg): *Zugehörigkeit des Koreanischen zur indogermanischen Sprachenfamilie.*

Hong-ryol RYU (Seoul): *Salient Characteristics of Korean Culture.*

John YOUNG (Washington, D.C.): *Some New Japanese Source Materials Available in the U. S. for the Study of East Asia.*

XIII: SÜDOSTASIEN

The readers of the *Journal* realize that Southeast Asia is neither South Asia nor East Asia, but a peculiar, balkanized extension of both on different levels with many Near Eastern elements introduced via Islam. Linguistically the European Balkans appear homogeneous by comparison. One is almost constrained to specialize in one area because of the linguistic and historical complications, or in prehistory. It is obvious that this is a one-sided approach to a civilization or an area and that the future will have to rectify it. More rapid progress would be possible if the few younger scholars born in the area who have been trained in the Western humanistic sciences without losing respect for their own past could be induced to devote themselves to making their cultural patrimony known to the world, to the East as much as to the West. At present educated Burmese, Thais, Cambodians, Vietnamese, Laotians, Malays, Indonesians, and Filipinos are apt to quote more Shakespeare, Racine, Vondel, and Cervantes than their own literary masterpieces and they almost never have any knowledge of those of their immediate neighbors. Piccadilly Circus, the polders and dikes, the sidewalk cafés, and Broadway are losing a little of their centrality these days, still the shift is to science and to English (if it was not acquired earlier) to the neglect of the neighboring language and literatures. When the heady rejoicing over independence has subsided somewhat, the young scholars from this area will fill in many of the lacunae in our present knowledge. In the meantime, the older shift will continue its work under a certain amount of strain and inconvenience.

Louis MALLERET (Saigon): *Ouvrages circulaires en terre dans l'Indochine méridionale.*

Tatsurō YAMAMOTO (Tokyo): *The Land System of Vietnam: Công-điền and Quân-điền.*

A. A. GUBER (Moscow): *Zur Frage der Klassenbildung in Indonesien bis 1945.*

Pierre BITARD (Paris): *A propos d'une canne horoscopique laotienne.*

M. Blanche LEWIS (London): *Some Phonetic Correspondances* [sic] *between Malay and Mawken, the Language spoken by the Orang Laut of the Mergui Archipelago.*

C. HOOYKAAS (London): *The Function of the Dalang.*

P. J. ZOETMULDER (Zeist): *Literarische Yantras.*

D. G. E. Hall (London): *Henry Burney, Diplomat and Orientalist.*

Jacoba H. HOOYKAAS (London): *Panji's Wedding Dance.*

H. J. DE GRAAF (Wassenaar): *Aufstieg und Untergang des Reiches Demak.*

H. Muhammed YAMIN (Jogjakarta): *Gliederung der Geschichte Indonesiens in fünf Epochen.*

Taryo OBAYASHI (temp. Cambridge, Mass.): *Die Schweinezucht in Hinterindien im Lichte der Völkerkunde.*

António DE ALMEIDA (Lisbon): *Art et Métiers du Timor* (Film).

Hellmut DRAWS-TYCHSEN (Pappenheim/Mittelfranken, Altes Schloß): *Völkerkundliche Betrachtungen über eine private Birma-Sammlung in Mährisch-Trübau* [Okresní Museum v Moravské Třebové].

XIV: AFRIKANISTIK

August KLINGENHEBEN (Hamburg): *Zur Entstehung des Klassensprachentyps in Afrika.*

Guy ATKINS (London): *Some Aspects of Bantu Numeration.*

F. W. PARSONS (London): *Case in Hausa.*

G. CARNOCHAN (London): *The Category of Number in Igbo.*

Johannes LUKAS (Hamburg): *Neue linguistische Forschungen im Tschadseegebiet.*

W. André A. WILSON (London): *Temne Phonology and Notation.*

Gordon INNES (London): *Some Reflections on Consonant Mutation in West African Languages.*

Ernst DAMMANN (Berlin): *Kausativbildungen in Bantusprachen.*

E. C. ROWLANDS (London): *Some Features of Nasalised Vowels in Yoruba.*

A. N. TUCKER (Sevenoaks, Kent): *Some Problems of Juncture in Lango.*

Alfred WILLMS (Hamburg): *Kriterien für radikales oder akzessorisches i und u im Verb des Tuareg.*

David RYCROFT (London): *Linguistic and Melodic Interaction in Zulu Song.*

Herma PLAZIKOWSKY-BRAUNER (Frankfurt/M.): *Die determinativen Elemente der kuschitischen Sprachen.*

D. A. OLDEROGGE (Moscow): *Osman dan Fodios Aufstand und seine Bedeutung.*

D. W. ARNOTT (London): *Some Remarks on the Dialects of Fula.*

Eike HABERLAND (Frankfurt/M.): *Das Verhältnis von Kultur und Sprachen in Äthiopien.* (KME).

CONCLUSION

As might be suspected, the purpose of this listing of a considerable number of the titles, especially of the second half of the *Akten*, was not to take the place of an index. That was thoughtfully provided by the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft. It was intended to prove clearly that the problems of "desegregation" among now-called Orientalists will demand more than a Supreme Court decision: they will demand a Solomonic one. What Orientalists have, or have had, in common is an awareness of vast amounts of *Kulturgut* which has not been fully incorporated into the body scientific of the Occident. There was not a single paper in this volume on the petrology of Assam or the engineering aspects of the Aswan Dam. Why? For the simple reason that such papers would appear in professional meetings of petrologists or geologists and of engineers, respectively. Assam and Aswan, both Oriental sites from an Orientalist's point of view, have little in common for the petrologist or engineer. Whatever he has learned elsewhere, he can apply here. There may be special problems of trained labor supply or of transportation for the engineer, but each new job entails some adaptation to local conditions. Chinese rockets and missiles, when they come, will be fundamentally like Russian or American ones with or without espionage, but not without benefit of access to the existing unclassified literature on the subject.

As old civilizations have been exhumed—No, a civilization cannot be exhumed; only its charred and charneled remains can. As the char-and-charnel of older civilizations comes to light, we have to revise our reference works, our textbooks, and even our desiccated lecture notes. Mathematics, linguistics, astronomy, botany, zoölogy, and numerous other disciplines have begun to incorporate and assimilate revealed or unveiled material from the buried past or from the exotic Orient. Art, law, and music are making progress in the same direction. Technology, medicine, and even statecraft are receiving Oriental accretions as they are made available. Our native Western conceit precluded much recognition at first, but reluctance is slowly yielding. Even beatniks are professed "Zennists" these days.

The primary ambition of Orientalists today should be to work for integration, or rather for synthesis. Whatever Ibn 'Arabî or Ibn Khaldûn contributed to mankind, let it be transmitted beyond Orientalists. Philosophers must include the philosophy of India, China, and the Islamic world at an early date if Western philosophy is not to become completely sterile. Historiography is an amputee without solid Arabic and Chinese underpinning. We Orientalists must not content ourselves with looking over the fences of our Orientalist neighbors, for that becomes almost an act of prurience at times. We have curiosity or we should never have got into the Oriental field in the first place. We must now stimulate this curiosity in our commensal academicians and lead members of each discipline to want to associate with us and to incorporate our special knowledge of the field that lies behind the rope-trick curtain. We must cease hiding behind an exotic veil of mystery and learn to talk the language of the West. Oriental studies must not be a refuge for *Schwärmer*; we must be linguists, historians, mathematicians, literary critics, art connoisseurs, physicians, jurists, etc. *ad majorem humanitatis gloriam*. Then many

school pupils brought up with a broader view of the world will master a discipline and give themselves the additional support provided by a knowledge of some Oriental language. The Orientalists will become as unnecessary as 'Occidentalists' are now. A scholar will be known as a specialist in Chinese poetry, philosophy, economics, history, medicine, or technology and not as a Sinologist. In this way China's contribution to these and other fields will be of the greatest value to the world. Such a specialist would associate with other literary critics, philosophers, economists, historians, etc. on an equal footing but with perhaps a slightly higher sense of mission until such time as they, too, took up areas for more intensive cultivation. Our Chinese historian would not try to convert his colleagues at the same institution into Chinese specialists; he would want them to add Arabic, Persian, or Indian competence to provide better coverage in the department. It may take fifty to a hundred years to abolish the title 'Orientalist' as such, but we should start the task now. We who love Japanese poetry can no longer palm ourselves off as sword fanciers, serigraphers, or *sukiyaki* cooks and we should not be required to go through the motions.

This volume—all fourteen sections of it—is of great interest to all Orientalists. Some of the most fascinating material is always to be found outside our own immediate Oriental area or discipline. For this very reason the *Akten* should be brought to the attention of our non-Orientalist colleagues. They should be allowed and encouraged to browse in Chinese, Indian, Arabic, and African pastures. They may do nothing about acquiring an Oriental-language competence themselves, but they might inspire students to do so before the imagination is stultified and the Occidental blinders become too firmly and permanently adjusted. The separate Oriental languages and literatures could then become disciplines of truly equal standing with English, German, French, and Russian, to say nothing of Spanish, which was singled out for special attention in an excursus earlier in this review.

For a number of years to come Orientalists will still be such. If I come to be known as a delendist, it is not because I want to destroy the person of Orientalists; it is because I want to destroy their isolation and see them fulfill their messianic mission of enriching Occidentalism without destroying it or letting it destroy itself by anarchic autarky. Humanism can be truly established only when both academic 'Occidentalism' and Orientalism are buried. These *Proceedings* constitute an excellent case for not keeping all this learning, devotion, and perceptivity within our membership when it should be made available to our colleagues. May each successive volume advance this cause further. May we stir in turmoil before we rest in peace!

Note

The typographical and editorial excellence of this work is such that mention of a very few typographical errors would be wholly uncalled for but for one thing: they appear—so far as my observations go—almost exclusively in the two "universal languages": English and French. The more intricate the specialty, the more complex the diacritics, the more accurate the typesetting or the proofreading. This is just possibly another argument for agreement on one language for scientific communication, which might be started earlier in life everywhere.

Another matter of greater significance in the United States and the Soviet Union, perhaps, but which is not without concern elsewhere is the habit of placing the author's place of residence in parenthesis after his name. The fact that one member of the Congress lives in Buckhurst Hill, Essex, is of no great importance to anyone but him and his friends; the meaningful parenthetic indication would be: (*SOAS, London*). A Harvard Orientalist might live in Belmont, Massachusetts while, conversely, (*Cambridge, Mass.*) might represent Massachusetts Institute of Technology as well as Harvard. Moscow, New York, and other metropolises are even more ambiguous in reference. The great German universities and many of the older ones in other countries were placed in smaller cities. The present tendency is for capitals and metropolises to abound in academic and government personnel with a great variety of affiliations. Could we have this changed for the Twenty-fifth Congress and its Proceedings?

DENZEL CARR

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The Sacred Bridge. By ERIC WERNER. Pp. xx + 618. New York: COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1959. $15.00.

After several centuries of scholarly research concerning the origins of ecclesiastical formulae and music for worship, wherein much was of necessity groping hypothesis, much one-sidedness, much mere guesswork, Professor Werner, with an astounding breadth of profound acquaintance with both Jewish and all Catholic forms of worship and music, offers us the first almost exhaustive comparative study of the interrelationship between Hebrew and Catholic cult. With great acumen and fairness he has endeavored to wend his way through the maze of often conflicting opinions that have been proposed to explain the origins and historical evolution of many elements in Catholic Liturgy and often the influence Catholic Liturgy has had on later developments in the worship of the Synagogue.

No mere assemblage of current and past conclusions of scholars, this work evidences the attempt of the author to rethink, re-evaluate and reconcile the research of the past. Most importantly, however, Professor Werner has himself gone to every available primary source, has examined it with keen insight, reinterpreted it when necessary and brought forth valuable conclusions. Nor was he content to repeat the vague generalizations of the past, but where possible he has been very specific with details of worship and music.

Part I of the work concerns the interrelationship between Jewish and Catholic ritual from the strictly historical and liturgical point of view, while II deals with musical comparisons. After trying to determine as minutely as possible the state of Jewish Liturgy at the period when Christianity began, the author discusses in general the leanings of early Christianity towards Jewish elements. Then in particular he treats of the similarities of both Church and Synagogue as to scriptural lessons, their musical rendition, the use of psalmody, semi-psalmodic and melismatic forms, hymns, acclamations, doxologies and the aesthetic and ethical evaluation of music in Synagogue and Church.

Part II brings us to strictly musical considerations. In a first chapter Professor Werner discusses the conflict between Hellenism and Judaism in the development of Christian music. And after discussing the origin of the Octoechos, he seeks out the interdependence between Judaism and Christianity in the use of ecphonetic notation, formulas and cadences of Lessons and Orations, the use and musical quality of plain, ornate psalmody and cognate forms, and finally the music of their respective hymns.

We cannot, of course, hope to give even an expression of the many results of the author's study. Let it suffice here to point out some of the salient conclusions that have been definitively reached. Of the many traces of Judaism in Catholic Liturgy the most obvious are the Hebraisms: Amen, Hosanna, Alleluia. Some of them have been assimilated by Christian worship in a translated form: phrases like "*in saecula saeculorum*," the *Sanctus*, "*Vere dignum et iustum est . . .*"

A peculiar relationship exists between the lectionaries of Synagogue and Church sometimes reflecting polemical or apologetic tendencies on both sides. The basic concept of the Jewish liturgical year was borrowed by the Church and linked with her Christological system of pericopes. An even pre-Jewish element, the system of the Pentecontade, was borrowed from Judaism and maintained in the Church. There are also some practices of fasting, vigils, processions, litanies and acclamations, characteristic of the Synagogue, which found their way into Christian worship after due Christological re-interpretation.

The hymn, though non-scriptural in origin, gradually absorbed post-biblical elements, many of which are midrashic in origin and character. A classical example of such a hymn is the pedigree of the Latin Church's sequence, *Dies irae.* Its literary motifs occur in a hymn composed by the Byzantine Romanus, who was a converted Syrian Jew; he himself must have heard the like in the midrashic hymns familiar to his youth. And today the synagogal liturgy contains the Hebrew counterpart of this sequence.

It is obvious that the canticle, response and refrain forms in Christian worship were inherited from the Temple. We must also admit that much of the Christian musical substance, if not most of it, came from the ancient Synagogue. Then, too, the form conceptions of dichotomous psalmody, scriptural cantillation and extended canticle chant are basic elements of the Jewish heritage. To this same substratum belongs the earliest concept of the eight modes, the octoechos, having originated

probably in pre-Jewish times in Mesopotamia. And we must add the Tract and the ornate versions of the Lamentations and also cognate solo renderings. Though undergoing many nuances in the course of history, Gregorian notation must ultimately be traced back to primitive Jewish notation of ecphonetic accents. And finally there is a multitude of melodic patterns used in melismatic Gregorian chant, some of the older antiphons, Graduals, the *Jubili*, the *Te Deum* and *Gloria* all of which find roots in ancient Israelitic *melos*.

Professor Werner is very reverent and fair in dealing with Christian history and institutions. It will not be taken amiss, I hope, if we insist that early Christian authorities were sincere and the faithful themselves convinced that Jesus Christ was the fulfillment of the Old Testament and that He founded a new religion, not just one more "Jewish sect among others" (p. 52). The author finds difficulty in understanding how Pope St. Clement, twenty-six years after the destruction of the Temple (p. 21), could refer to this institution as a still existing authority. Surely, if Clement's statements about the Temple were read in context, the author would see that Clement was simply expressing the profound Christian mysticism which sees everything of eternal value in the Old Testament as fulfilled in Jesus Christ and therefore still existing in Him.

We must also disagree with the eminent author when he claims that nothing is left of the continuous reading idea (p. 60). We need only point to the lessons of the Roman Breviary which run in sequence. Then there are the Epistles of the Masses for the Sundays after Pentecost which, though not forming a continuous reading, are taken from the Catholic and Pauline Epistles in their biblical order.

We need not search so far, as does the author (p. 85), for the reason behind the institution of Palm Sunday in the Jacobite Syrian Church's combination of Matt. 21 with Lev. 23:34 (this latter speaks of the feast of Tabernacles and its use of palm branches). Matt. 21 and John 12:13 both describe the event which took place in Jerusalem when the Jews cut down palm branches and other greens to throw in the way of Jesus as He approached the Holy City. To insist that the Church derived the custom of carrying palm branches in procession on Palm Sunday from the fact that in Syriac *Hosanna* means palm branches is, I'm afraid, a bit far-fetched; such reasoning either ignores the testimony of Matthew and John or pretends that it is not authentic, for in actuality such a Gospel account would be reason enough for our ecclesiastical custom.

On page 122 Professor Werner cites a prayer from *Taanith* II, 1 and says that it is paraphrased in the epiclesis of the Mass of both Roman and Eastern Churches. The Roman Mass has no epiclesis strictly speaking; the prayer of the Canon of the Roman Mass which seems to have an epicletic intent, the *Quam oblationem* bears no trace of the Jewish prayer in question. However, a prayer begging God to accept our oblation directly following upon the consecration of the Mass, *Supra quae*, does make mention of Abraham.

Again he tells us that a psalm rendered in solo style has survived in the psalmody of the Nocturns, which he calls the oldest element of daily worship (p. 133). Such a type of psalmody is not present in the nocturns of the Roman Rite, nor do the nocturns constitute the oldest element of daily worship in any Rite. Lauds and Vespers have been proven to be the point of departure for the development of the ecclesiastical hours of the Office. And on page 134 he says that Nocturns and Lauds correspond exactly to the evening and morning service of the Synagogue. Nocturns, or, as we call them, Matins, are not an evening service, but rather a vigil service. Vespers are the evening service of the Church. Nor can we admit that responsorial psalmody is the most common form of psalmody today in all Christian liturgies (p. 134); rather antiphonal psalmody is the most common. It does not seem correct to say that "the form and text of the Latin Mass attained their overwhelming popularity only at the expense of all other forms of Catholic worship" (p. 135). Admittedly it is a little difficult to understand what the author intends by such a statement, but the Mass is and always has been the center of Catholic worship, and lay participation in the Office was a phenomenon which lasted for centuries after the form and text of the Mass were firmly fixed.

The vowels E U O U A E are indeed placed in Roman antiphonals and other chant books to represent the entire words "seculorum Amen," (pp. 138, 303) but they are never sung without the accompanying consonants. They are printed in this way only to indicate to the chanters the proper musical ending of the Doxology.

The Church does speak of the therapeutic value of singing the psalms (p. 147-148) but not for any magical reasons. The value of the psalms, even against attacks of the devil and bodily ailments, comes rather from the spirit of devotion with which they inspire the singer.

Professor Werner's statement that psalms 148, 149, and 150 are sung daily at Lauds of the Divine Office (p. 158) is no longer true of the Roman Rite; this practice obtained only up until the time of Pope Pius X.

The Benedictine Rule does not stipulate that psalm 145 be sung every day before Lauds, as the author thinks (p. 166, note 118), but rather psalm 66. Nor is the Tract sung by a soloist in the Roman Church (p. 171).

We need not insist that Christianity drew on pagan religious rites for its use of the Kyrie eleison, as the author thinks (p. 174). It was commonly used both in pre-Christian and Christian times for purely civil affairs. Here is the closest point of contact.

The Invitatory for Matins of Easter Sunday is, not "*Surrexit Deus vere, Alleluia,*" (p. 176), but "*Surrexit Dominus vere, Alleluia.*"

Again the author speaks of the soloist as reigning supreme in the Tract and as dominating the Offertory (p. 191). This simply is not true. And he thinks that the Rule of St. Benedict provided for the singing of five verses at the Gradual (p. 205, note 91). Actually the Mass does not enter into his legislation.

While speaking of the Invitatory psalm 94, Professor Werner says correctly that daily Matins begins always with this call to prayer (p. 281), but when he says that it is also used in other parts of the Church service, we are unaware of what he could mean.

To say that the Gospels are remarkable for the absence of liturgical passages, or that they are in fact anti-liturgical in spirit and expression (p. 298), is to run counter to the best scholarship among our modern Catholic exegetes [cf., e.g.: David M. Stanley, S. J., "Liturgical Influences on the Formation of the Four Gospels," *The Church Year.* Proceedings of the 19th North American Liturgical Week (Elsberry, Mo., 1959), pp. 159-167].

Such mistakes are quite understandable in such a monumental work as Professor Werner's, especially when we consider the fact that they deal with things with which the author has not had first hand acquaintance, but which he had to study. And they in no way truly mar the quality of his work. We are deeply grateful to him for what must have been really painstaking work in preparing this volume, for it shall ever be *the* first-rate reference book on Jewish and Christian liturgical relationships.

Rev. John H. Miller, C. S. C.

Holy Cross College and
The Catholic University of America

Al-Ghazālī, Tahāfut al-Falāsifah (*Incoherence of the Philosophers*). Translated into English by Ahmad Sabih Kamali. Pp. 267. Lahore: Pakistan Philosophical Congress, 1958.

The task confronting the translator of al-Ghazālī's brilliant attack on Islamic Aristotelianism is a difficult one. For not only are the arguments intricate and subtle, but al-Ghazālī's style does not lend itself easily to an English rendition. Mr. Kamali has succeeded in producing a very readable translation of this philosophical classic. His production, however, does call for some critical comments:

To begin with, we are not told on which of the two editions of the Arabic text mentioned in the bibliography the translation is based. No marginal pagination referring to either edition is given. The translator gives no introduction of his own. The notes are sparse and fail to comment on many an important issue requiring explanation. In the bibliography some of the titles are given in Arabic, the publication details in a European language. The abbreviation "Vbg" appears in the notes without explanation.

The translation tends to be free and not enough attention is always given to technical expressions or terms. Here we can only give some examples. The "etc." in "but the substances perish when God would not create in them motion or rest etc.,"

(p. 59, 11, 29-30) is not very helpful. The translation of *wa lā ijtimā'an wa lā iftirāqan*, "nor combination nor separation" should have been included since it tells us something about the atomic theory in question and helps us recognize it as a theory implicit in the *Tamhīd* of Bāqillāni. *Mūjab* should have been rendered "necessitated" and not "product" (p. 16, l. 17): the issue of necessary causal relations is at the bottom of the argument in question. "Material validity of syllogism" (p. 10, 11, 24-25) is an unhappy rendition of *ṣiḥḥat māddat al-qiyās. Māddat al-qiyās*, "the matter of the syllogism," stands for the premises. Normally we speak of the truth or falsity of premises, the validity or invalidity of inferences, deductions, etc. In the important fourth preface there is a serious error (p. 10). The translation here raises many an issue which cannot be dealt with in detail. But this much is clear: when al-Ghazālī tells us that he proposes to use the terminology of the philosophers instead of the theologians, he is referring to the policy he is to pursue in the *Tahāfut* itself, not in some other work, as the translator interprets him.

Yet in its larger contours the translation gives the substance of the thought correctly. Indeed, many an argument difficult to follow in the Arabic is clearer in the translation.

MICHAEL E. MARMURA
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

V. S. Apte's The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary. Editors-in-chief, P. K. GODE and C. G. KARVE. Vol. I (a-k); vol. II (kh-m). Pp. 1296. Poona: PRASAD PRAKASHAN, 1957-8.

The first edition of this dictionary was published in 1890 and in the next three or four decades two other editions, which were only reprints, appeared. Since the first edition appeared, a number of new Sanskrit texts have been published. *Eo ipso* new words from these texts could not have been included in this dictionary. It is therefore a gratifying fact that infatigable P. K. Gode, Curator of the Bhāṇḍārkar Oriental Research Institute and C. G. Karve have decided to prepare a "revised and enlarged edition" of Apte's *Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary.*

The dictionary under review is in fact revised and enlarged. As can be seen from the list of abbreviations the following works, some of which like Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra were discovered a few decades ago, have been additionally taken into consideration: Bhaviṣya-purāṇa, Bilhaṇacaritam, Bhāratamañjarī, Brahmavaivarta-purāṇa, Buddhacaritam, Chandomañjarī, Dhanurveda-saṁhitā, Ekārthanāmamālā of Saubhari, Gīrvāṇa-laghukośa, Hitopadeśa-prastāvikā, Kauṭilīya-arthaśāstra, Lalitavistara, Mānasāra, Mātāṅgalīlā of Nīlakaṇṭha, Nānārthamañjarī of Rāghava, Pañcarātra, Pratijñā Yaugandharāyaṇa, Rāmacaritam by Yuvarāja Kavi, Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya, Śabdhacintāmaṇi, Śivabhārata by Paranānanda, Śukranīti, Sūktisundara, Taittirīya-upaniṣad, Taittirīya-brāhmaṇa, Taittirīya-saṁhitā, Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana, Viśvaguṇādarśacampū, etc. Also several new vocables from the Āyurveda, Sāhityaśāstra, Jainism and Buddhism were incorporated in the Dictionary.

The new edition of the Dictionary has substituted the *parasarvaṇa* method in place of the *anusvāra* method, used in the original Apte's Dictionary. It was also greatly enlarged, since its first edition contained up to letter *m* inclusive 882 pages, while the new edition contains 1296 pages.

To date only the two first volumes of the Dictionary have appeared.[1] The editors-in-chief were assisted for the first volume by Mm. Prof. K. V. Abhyankar, Prof. M. D. Sathe, Dr. V. G. Rahurkar and Śrī D. G. Padhye and for the second volume by Dr. V. G. Rahurkar, Prof. R. N. Gadre and Śrī D. G. Padhye.

[1] After the review of the first two volumes of the Dictionary has been sent to the printer, the third and last volume of the Dictionary appeared. Thus, the very valuable work of P. K. Gode and C. G. Karve, the editors-in-chief, has been completed.

The third volume contains, in addition to words from *y* to *h*, six very useful appendices. These appendices deal with: (1) Sanskrit prosody and Sanskrit metres; (2) Dates, words etc. of important Sanskrit writers; (3) Important geographical names in ancient India; (4) Sanskrit lexicons; (5) Popular short maxims; and (6) Grammatical concordance.

With the substantial additions of new words of different shades of meaning and appropriate quotations from various sources, this new revised and enlarged edition of Apte's Dictionary becomes perhaps the best Sanskṛt-English Dictionary available at present. It is, as far as possible, complete and correct. P. K. Gode and C. G. Karve should be whole-heartedly congratulated for the excellent work done. It is to be hoped that the third and last volume of the Dictionary will appear soon.[1]

In his first edition of the Dictionary, Apte wrote that not even the gigantic Vācaspatya of the late professor Tārānātha Tarkavācaspati, nor the equally gigantic German Wörterbuch of Drs. Roth and Böhtlingk can be said to be altogether complete. He did not aspire to accomplish a complete dictionary in any sense of the word. Therefore, as Apte did in 1890, this reviewer would like to put the greatest emphasis on the Dictionary's practicability, handiness, lucidity and almost faultless printing.

The preparation of a dictionary is always a difficult task; it becomes more difficult when a dictionary is prepared for a rich language; it becomes an almost impossible task if the language is as rich as Sanskṛt is.

The reviewer who is particularly interested in *dharma, artha* and *kāma,* used the Dictionary for several months and found in there most of the expressions he needed; however some law, technical and specific terms seem to him to be missing. He wishes to add a few of them which he came across when using the Dictionary and which might profitably be added to it. He used in the list below the abbreviations as employed in the work under review, with the following additions: Abh. V. (Abhidharmakośa of Vasubandhu, ed. by Stcherbatsky); Am. S. (Amitagati's Subhāṣitasaṁdoha, Leipzig 1908); As. (Asahāya on Nr.); bot. (botany); coll. (colloquial); comp. (compound); DK. (Śūlapāṇi's Dīpakālikā, ed. by Ghārpure, 1939); fig. (figurative); GA. (Govardhana's Āryāsaptaśati in KM. 1); HA. (Hemacandra's Abhidhānacintāmaṇināmamālā, St. Petersburg 1847); Hal. (Halāyudha's Abhidhānaratnamālā, London 1861); HP. (Hemacandra's Pariśiṣṭaparvan, ed. by Hertel); HY. (Hemacandra's Yogaśāstra, ed. by Hertel); Jay. (Jayamaṅgalā on Vātsy.); KM. (Kāvyamāla, Nirṇaya Sāgara Press); l. t. (law-term); Mdh. (Medhātithi on Ms.); med. (medicine); Nr. (Nārada-smṛti, ed. by J. Jolly, Calcutta 1885); phil. (philosophy); PrC (Prabandhacintāmaṇi, Siṅghī SS. 1); SC. (Smṛti-candrikā, ed. by Ghārpure, 1918); ŚlS. (Bṛhat-kathā-ślokasaṁgraha of Buddhasvāmin, Paris 1908); Śuk. (Śukasaptati *textus ornatior,* ABayA. 21); VS. (Viṣṇu-smṛti, ed. by J. Jolly, Calcutta 1881); VyM. (Vyavahāra Mayūkha, ed. by P. V. Kane, BSS. 80).

[Regarding abbreviations it seems to this reviewer that it would have been more useful if the list used in the first edition of the Dictionary, as well as in the Dictionary under review, would also give details about the works used, *i. e.,* the author, the editor and the place where it was printed, since very often one work was edited several times and it proved impossible for this reviewer to recheck the quotations; *e. g.,* there are some twenty different editions of the Cāṇakyaśataka, eleven of which were published in Calcutta.]

Additional specific terms:[2]

atiṣkadavarī 'leaping over, a procuress of abortion, a prostitute,' (fig.) Vāj., ed. by A. Weber (30.14). Cf. Macdonnel and Keith, *Vedic Index* (1.481).

atītvarī 'walking over, a streetwalker, a prostitute,' (fig.) Vāj., ed. by A. Weber (30.14). Cf. Macdonnel and Keith, *Vedic Index* (1.481).

adāsī 'a non-slave, not purchased, a prostitute who stands between an inferior prostitute-slave (*dāsī*) and a courtesan (*kṛtāvarodhā*), Kau. A. (146.12, sqq.).

adhilīlāgṛha (comp.) 'house of pleasure, brothel,' Naiṣ. (1.38).

anekaparigrahā 'a girl who is on friendly terms with more than one man, a prostitute,' (fig.) Jay. on Vātsy. (341.25).

anvāhita 'one of the several kinds of deposit, deposit for delivery,' (l. t.) Mitā. *ad* Y. 2.67), Vīr. M. *ad* (Y. 2.67).

apagṛhita 'invalid action,' (l. t.) Nr. (1.40).

aparigrahā 'a girl who is on friendly terms with more than one man, a prostitute,' (fig.) Jay. on Vātsy. (341.25).

apaskadvarī 'leaping over, a procuress of abortion, a prostitute,' (fig.) Vāj. ed. by A. Weber (1.481). Cf. Macdonnel and Keith, *Vedic Index* (1.481).

abhaya 'one of the several kinds of surety, surety for safety,' (l. t.) Hārita in SC.

abhityāka (*ā*) 'an outcast,' (l. t.) Kau. A. (ch. 12).

arpita after 5 add: 'deposit,' (l. t.).

avaruddhā 'a person who is under the protection of a

[2] In this review the unusual words in the Dharmasūtras, collected by S. C. Banerji in his 'Lexicographical Notes' (*IHQ.* 34.114 sqq.) are not mentioned; they should be added to the list given below.

private person, a captive, a concubine, a mistress, a prostitute who puts herself under the protection of a private person,' (l. t.). Kau. A. (124. 4-5). Pl. 'women of the harem' Nr. (12. 79).

avaruddhavadhū (comp.) 'a prostitute,' Smardīpikā (1. 431, 5).

avastha(ā) 'one of the several kinds of surety; surety for safety (l. t.),' Kau. A. (194).

asatīpoṣaka (comp.) 'guardian of unfaithful women, guardian of prostitutes,' HY. (3. 111).

ātmopajiva(°in) 'men living on the prostitution of their wives, pimps,' (l. t.) Mdh. *ad* Ms. (8. 362).

ādhikṛta 'employee,' (l. t.) Bṛh. (10. 79).

ādhipāla 'keeper of the pledge,' (l. t.) As. *ad* Nr. (1. 24).

ādhibhoga(ḥ) add 'usufructuary pledge,' (l. t.) Gau. S. (12. 34-5).

ādhyupabhoga 'one of the several kinds of pledge, pledge for custody,' (l. t.) VS. (ch. 6).

āpaṇanārī (°*yoṣā*) 'a woman who is like an article of commerce, a prostitute,' (fig.) AmS. (24. 21, 22 for *āpaṇanārī*; 24. 20 for *āpaṇayoṣā*).

āyati 'profit,' (l. t.) Kau. A. (124. 6).

āsanna 'neighbour,' (l. t.) Kau. A. (III. 13).

upanikṣepa 'one of several kinds of deposits,' (l. t.) Y. (2. 25); 'chattel placed for safe-custody in another's hand after exhibiting its quality and quantity,' Mitā. *ad* Y. 2. 25); 'deposit placed in a vessel without mentioning its details,' DK. *ad* Y. (2. 25).

upasavitrī 'a procuress,' Smardīpikā (2. 374, 4).

upasthāna 'one of several kinds of sureties; surety for appearance,' (l. t.) Y. (2. 53), VS. (6. 41), Nr. (1. 118).

uṣā add in line 4: 7a; 'a courtezan.' Cf. R. Pischel and K. Geldner, *Vedische Studien* 1897, (XXV).

ṛccharā 'she who serves male persons, a prostitute. Uṇādikośa cited in Śabdak. *ad ṛccharā* identifies this word with *veśyā*.

ekaparigrahā 'a girl who is on friendly terms with one man, a prostitute who is attached to one man,' Jay. on Vātsy. (341. 25).

kaṇeru 'a she-elephant, a prostitute.' Medhini in Śabdak. identifies this word with *veśyā* and *kariṇī*. Cf. above *kaṇerā* (also *kanerā*).

kanyā add to 2: 'or a girl of 12 years of age, *i. e.*, a girl whose breasts are not yet developed,' (l. t.) B. P. in Vīr. M. (768. 23).

karavīra 'a kind of tree with white, red or yellow flowers, and the like, which is generally straight and smooth, *nerium odorium oujeinensis*,' (bot.) Y. (2. 229), Mitā. (*ad* Y. 2. 229).

kariṇī add 3: "a prostitute.' Anekārthasamuccaya of Śāśvata (Poona 1918) and Medini in Śabdak. (*ad kaṇerū*) identify this word with *veśyā*.

kareṇu see above *kaṇerū*.

karmakara 'a worker, a hired servant,' (l. t.). Nr. (5. 3).

kalakūjikā (°*kūṇikā*) 'an unchaste woman, a prostitute,' HA. (529 a).

kāmarekhā (°*lekhā*) 'a courtezan.' Śabdamālā in Śabdak. identifies this word with *veśyā*, and the like.

kayikā add at the end: 'corporal interest; one of the six kinds of interest, *i. e.*, interest connected with manual labour, or that which arises from the use of a female quadrupede to be milked, or a male to carry burden,' (l. t.) Vyāsa on Bṛh. (10. 10), Gau. S. (12. 35).

kāritā 'stipulated interest; one of the six kinds of interest, *i. e.*, interest promised by the borrower,' (l. t.) Bṛh. (10, 10), Gaut. S. (12. 35), Kāty. (498).

kālakṛta 'one of the several kinds of pledge; pledge contracted for a limited time,' (l. t.) Y. (2. 58-61).

kiṁśuka 'a tree used for marking boundaries, *butea frondosa*,' (bot.) Ms. (3. 246).

kucahīna 'a girl without breasts; a girl who did not yet attain puberty,' (l. t.) Āṅgīra, B. P. in Vīr. M. (768-9).

kuṭī 'a crooked woman, a procuress,' L. R. Vaidya's *Standard Sanskrit-English Dictionary*.

kuṭṭana (°*āna*) 'a procurer,' Haravijaya in KM. (15. 44).

kumārī add after 1: 'or a girl of more than 12 years of age, a girl who already attained her puberty,' (l. t.) Kaśyāpa in Vīr. M. (769).

kumbhadāsī add: 'a harlot; an inferior *veśyā*,' Vātsy. (184. 12); 'a harlot who wears white clothes, jewels, gold strips, is good and makes use of perfumes,' Vātsy. (348. 3). Identified with *gaṇikā* and *rūpājīvā* (Vātsy. 347. 7; 348. 19), or *paricārikā, kulaṭā, svairiṇī, naṭī, śilpakārikā, prakāśvinaṣṭā, rūpājīvā, gaṇikā* (Vātsy. 364. 13-4), or *veśyā, lāsikā, vārastrī, rūpājīvā, gaṇikā* (Milind. in Dk. 331).

kulaṭā 'an unfaithful woman, a prostitute identified with *veśyā*'; (fig.) Vātsy. (363. 13-4), Rasaratnahāra (27).

kṛtakāla 'one of several kinds of pledge, pledge limited as to time, *i. e.*, which must be redeemed within a certain period of time,' (l. t.) Nr. (1. 124).

kṛtakūlopaneya synonym of *kṛtakāla*. See above.

kṛtāparādhā 'a girl who commits a fault, a prostitute, an inferior prostitute,' Vātsy. (146. 18); 'a prostitute placed higher than a *dāsī* and an *adāsī*,' Kau. A. (146. 12).

kṛtāvarodhā synonym of *kṛtaparādhā*. See above, Kau. A. (146, 12), Vātsy. (146. 13).

kauśikastrī 'a woman for sexual intercourse, a prostitute,' Kau. A. (380. 15).

krayaproṣita 'one of several kinds of deposits, object sold but still in the hands of the vendor (*constitutum possessorium*), (l. t.) Kāty. (592).

krīḍasadman 'house of amusement, brothel,' Śṛṅgāratilabhāṇa (KM) (62a).

kṣudrā add: 'a despised woman,' Hal. (2. 335).

khagālikā 'an Indian cuckoo (expression for falsehood), a courtezan identified with *veśyā, cāravāṇikā, kṣudrā, malekhā*,' HA. (*ad* 533).

khaṇḍaśīlā 'a woman of bad conduct, a faithless woman, a prostitute,' (fig.) HA. (529a).

gaganagaṇikā (comp.) 'a divine courtezan,' Smardīpikā (2.230, 11).

gaḍucī 'a plant generally growing on trees and used for medical purposes, a kind of plant which even when cut grows and develops in various parts (*cocculus cordifoleus*), (bot.) Mitā. (*ad* Y. 2.229).

gaṇāṅganā (comp.) 'a prostitute,' GA. (678).

gaṇikāgṛha (comp.) 'a house of a courtezan, brothel,' HAn. (Bombay 1893; 2.372b).

gaṇikādārikā (comp.) 'a young harlot,' Kāmamañjarī in Dk. is identified with a *gaṇikā*.

gaṇikādāsī (comp.) 'a slave who is a courtezan; such a courtezan is "capable of rendering service in the form of enjoyment; she had to work in the storehouse or in the kitchen of the king,"' (Kau. A. (124.3).

gaṇikānā 'an assembly of courtezans, a multitude of courtezans.' HA. identifies this word with *gaṇikya* (1420a). See below.

gaṇikābhṛti (comp.) 'courtezan's salary.' HA. identifies this word with *bhoga* (363a).

gaṇikāmātar (comp.) 'a courtezan's mother, a procuress. Apohāravarman's Adventure in Dk.

gaṇikāya 'a guardian of courtezans,' (l.t.), *i.e.*, the king's officer who deals with the financial affairs of courtezans who are the property of the king,' Kau. A. (124.6).

gaṇikyā 'an assembly of courtezans, a multitude of courtezans.' HA. identifies this word with *gaṇikānā* (1420a). See also Hal. (2.336), Ak. (1118).

guptaveśyā (comp.) 'a secret prostitute, a girl who is a prostitute in secret and belongs to an honest family,' Mahānirvāṇatantra (XXVII).

gulma 'a plant that is less valuable, a creeper that does not develop into considerable length, *e.g.*, *mālatī* (*echites Caryophyllata*),' Mitā. (*ad* Y. 2.223).

gūḍhājīvā 'a woman who makes her living secretly, a prostitute,' Kau. A. (214.14).

gṛhītabandhopasthāna (comp.) 'one of several kinds of sureties, surety for delivering a pledge,' (l.t.), Vyāsa in SC. (347).

gopālaka 'a herdsman,' Kau. A. (158.11-2).

gopya 'one of several kinds of pledge, pledge for custody,' (l.t.) Bṛh. (10.38-9), Nr. (1.124).

gopyādhi (comp.) 'one of several kinds of pledge, pledge for custody,' (l.t.) Y. (2.58-61).

gaudhārī 'a girl who is more than ten years old and has not yet attained puberty,' (l.t.), Āśvalāyana-gṛhyasūtra in Vīr. M. (767-8).

gaurī add after 2: 'or a girl of seven years of age,' Kaśyāpa, Āśvalāyana-gṛhyasūtra, B. P. in Vīr. M. (767-8).

caritra add after 6: 'one of several kinds of pledge, pledge the value of which is much larger than the loan given,' (l.t.) Śukra.

cāravānikā 'a harlot, identified with *veśyā*, *khagālikā*, *kṣudrā* and *malekhā*,' HA. (*ad* 533a).

jaṅgama 'one of several kinds of pledge, a movable pledge,' Bṛh. (10.38-9), Kāty. (516).

japya 'a creeping plant (bot.),' Ms. (11.142), Y. (3.276).

jaracchikhā 'an old procuress; Samayamātṛkā (5.1).

tīrthagā 'a prostitute of *tīrthas* identified with *brahmaveśyā*,' Mahānirvāṇatantra (XXVII).

trapāraṇḍā 'an unfaithful woman (widow), a prostitute,' Jaṭṭādhara in Śabdak. identifies this word with *veśyā* (*ad trapāraṇḍā*) and *puṁścalī*, *laṅkā*, *niśacārī* (*ad puṁścalī*).

tridaśavadhū (°*vanitā*, °*sudṛś*) (comp.) 'heavenly woman, heavenly prostitute, Apsaras.' The first expression is found in M. W., the second in Ms., the third in Rasadanabhāṇa (30c).

tridivayuvati (°*strī*) (comp.) 'a heavenly woman, a heavenly prostitute, Apsaras.' The first expression is found in Śrīkaṇṭhacarita (23.40), the second in Smardīpikā (l. 539, 2).

darśana 'one of several kinds of sureties, surety for appearance,' (l.t.) Hārita in SC. (346).

dāna 'one of several kinds of sureties, surety for payment,' (l.t.), Y. (2.53), VS. (6.41).

dārikāveśman (comp.) 'house of prostitutes, brothel.' Kuṭṭanīmata (367).

duṣṭā 'a corrupted girl, a prostitute,' Śabdaratnāvalī in Śabdak. (*ad dūṣṭā* identifies this word with *puṁścalī*, *dhṛṣṭā* and *dharṣitā*.

devadārikā (°*paricārikā*, °*veśyā*) (comp.) 'a heavenly prostitute, Apsaras.' The first expression is found in Smardīpikā (1.583, 5), the second in Śabdak. (*ad devadāsī*), the third in Mahānirvāṇatantra (XXVII). Cf. Pischel and Geldner, *Vedische Studien* (1.275).

devatāveśa (comp.) 'a woman devoted to prostitution who serves the gods, temple prostitute,' Samayamātṛkā (2.85). J. J. Meyer translates *devatāveśyā* as "Tempelaufseherin eine Hälterin (Aufseherin) der Hurenwirtschaft der Gottheiten."

dyupuraṁdhrī (°*yuvati*, °*yoṣit*, °*lokanārī*, °*vadhū*, °*strī*) (comp.) 'a heavenly woman, a heavenly prostitute, Apsaras.' The first expression is found in Raj.T. (1.68), the second in Haravijaya (43.385), the third in Ks., the fourth in Haravijaya (15.38), the fifth and sixth in Ks.

dharṣiṇī 'an impudent woman, a prostitute identified with *dharṣaṇī*,' HA. (528a), Ak. in Śabdak. (*ad dharṣaṇī*).

dravya 'movable property,' (l.t.) Bṛh.

dravina 'movable property,' (l.t.) Bṛh. (10.73).

dvyāmuṣyayāṇa 'son of two fathers, son born *per procura* (*niyoga*),' (l.t.) VyM. (114).

nagarasyavibhūṣaṇa (comp.) 'a ornament of the town, a courtezan,' (fig.) Mk. (7th act).

nagarī 'a town girl, a prostitute,' Mahānirvāṇatantra (XXVII).

nagnikā 'a girl who has not yet attained puberty,' (l.t.) Āṅgīra, B. P. in Vīr. M. (768-9).

narmadā 'a woman who gives pleasure, a prostitute,' GA. (440, 455), Rasikarañjana (Śṛṅgare) (9).

nākā° (°*adhīpa*, °*narī*, °*puraṁdhrī*, °*vanitā*, °*strī*) 'a

heavenly woman, an Apsaras.' The first expression is found in Naiṣadhacarita, the second in Ks. and Śi. (11. 29), the third in Bālarāmāyaṇa, the fourth in HA., the fifth in Ks.

nāgarakapraṇidhi (comp.) 'a superintendent of the city,' (l. t.) Kau. A. (144).

nabhoyuvati (comp.) 'a heavenly young woman, a heavenly young prostitute, a young Apsaras,' Haravijaya (5. 52).

nigūḍha 'a woman available for sexual intercourse not in an open market,' (l. t.) Mdh. (*ad* Ms. 8. 362).

nidḥā(ya) 'deposit,' (coll.) Ks. (4. 1, 26-7).

nirdiṣṭa 'a specified pledge,' (l. t.) Kāty. (520).

nirvastuka 'foundation,' (phil.) Abh. V. (5. 7, 3).

niśacāri 'a woman walking during the night, a prostitute, a dissolute woman,' Medinī in Śabdak. (*ad kulaṭā*).

niṣkraya 'redemption,' (l. t.) Kau. A. (123. 18).

nṛtu 'a dancer, a prostitute,' Rv. (1. 92-4).

nṛśaṁsa 'a bard,' (l. t.) Ms. (4. 214-6).

paṇaramaṇī (°*sundarī*, °*hariṇīdṛś*) 'a woman who receives wages, a prostitute.' The first and the third expressions are found in PrC. (114. 9 and 313. 5), the second in HP. (2. 235, 288).

paṇyagaṇikā (°*narī*, °*puraṁdhrī*, °*lalanā*, °*vanitā*, °*vadhū*) 'a venal woman, a prostitute.' The first expression is found in Śuk. (26), the second in Kuṭṭanīmata (276), the third in AmS. (24. 5, 25), the fourth in Samayamātṛkā (8. 36), the fifth in AmS. (24. 16, 23, 24), the sixth in Samayamātṛkā (8. 102).

paricārikā add 1a: "a prostitute who serves the master Vātsy. (364. 13-4, 363. 17, 365. 12, 68. 19, 184. 3-4), Mb. (Roy's ed.) (1. 80, 22).

pāpayoṣitā 'a wicked woman, a prostitute,' (also *parayoṣitā*) identical with *paṇyayoṣitā*. VyM. (101. 10).

pogaṇḍa 'one of several kinds of deposits,' (l. t.) Nr. (16).

pogaṇḍadhāna (comp.) 'one of several kinds of deposits,' As. (*ad* Nr. 16).

prakaṭapramadā (comp.) 'a young prostitute,' Kuṭṭanīmata (322).

prakāśayuvatī (comp.) 'a young prostitute,' Kuṭṭanīmata (734).

pratikāra 'safety measure,' (l. t.) Kau. A. (152. 7).

pratiganikā (comp.) 'a substitute courtezan, a substitute for the king's servant, a *gaṇikā*,' (l. t.) Kau. A. (123. 10, 123. 12).

pratinyāsa (comp.) 'one of several kinds of deposits, mutual deposit,' (l. t.) Nr. (2. 14), Mitā. (*ad* Y. 2. 67).

pratibhāvya (comp.) 'one of several kinds of surety, surety money,' (l. t.) Gaut. S. (12. 41), Kau. A. (189. 12).

pratirodhaka 'under restraint,' (l. t.) Kau. A. (152. 7).

pratyaya 'one of several kinds of sureties, surety for honesty,' (l. t.) Y. (2. 53), VS. (6. 41), Nr. (1. 118).

pradarśana 'one of several kinds of sureties, surety for appearance,' (l. t.).

pramāracanā 'a wanton woman, a prostitute,' Śabdaratnāvalī in Śabdak.

pramādikā 'a wanton woman, a prostitute,' Śabdaratnāvalī in Śabdak.

prayāsabhogya (comp.) 'one of several kinds of pledge, usufructuary pledge, pledge with or without work,' (l. t.) Kau. A. (178. 16).

prātilobhya add 2: 'penalty of cutting off a woman's nose,' (l. t.) Y. (2. 286).

phalabhogya (comp.) 'one of several kinds of pledge, usufructuary pledge, pledge to be used,' (l. t.) Y. (2. 58-61).

bandiśūlā 'a wife of a bard, a prostitute,' Galanos' Dictionary and M. W.

bandhakīposaka (°*poṣaṇa*) (comp.) 'he who chastises prostitutes, guardian of prostitutes,' (l. t.) Kau. A. (24. 16, 378. 1, 382.7; cf. 241. 16).

bandhavī 'a woman who has intercourse with many men, a wanton woman, a prostitute,' Ak. (Calcutta 1807; Nṛvarga 10b, p. 43. 9-10).

bhuktādhirna 'one of several kinds of pledge, usufructuary pledge,' (l. t.) G. 12. 32).

bhujaṅga 'a lover of a prostitute,' HA. (519a), Hal. (2. 227).

bhuñjāpaka 'one of several kinds of sureties, surety for delivery a pledge,' (l. t.) SC. (347).

bhogavetana (comp.) 'compensation,' (l. t.) Kau. A. (178).

bhogya 'one of several kinds of pledge, usufructuary pledge,' (l. t.) Nr. (1. 124).

bhogyādhi (comp.) 'one of several kinds of pledge, usufructuary pledge,' (l. t.) Y. (2. 58-61).

manohārī 'an infaithful woman, a prostitute,' HA. (*ad* 529a).

malekhā 'a young girl, a prostitute identified with *veśyā*,' HA. (533).

māṇavikā add 2: 'a prostitute,' P. (3. 4, 72).

mātṛ add 3a: 'a mother of a prostitute, a procuress,' Kau. A. (123. 12), Vātsy. (315. 15 sqq., 320, 321), Dk. (205. 79), Śuk. (VII, XXVII), Pt. (Tantrākhyāyikā [App.]), Ks. (Tar. 12).

mātṛkā see above (*deminutivum*) 'a mother of a prostitute, a procuress,' Kau. A. (123. 6, 124. 19, 113. 18, etc.), Vātsy. (315. 5 sqq.).

mānuṣa, mānuṣa-vivāha 'one of the principal eight forms of marriage identical with the *āsura-vivāha*,' (l. t.).

mithyācāra (comp.) 'improper conduct, wrong treatment,' (l. t.). Suśr. (370).

mithyāpravṛtta (comp.) 'view falsely conceived,' (phil.) Abh. V. (5. 7, 3).

mithyāmāna (comp.) 'an act of attribution to oneself of qualities which one does not possess (one of the seven *mānas*),' (phil.). Abh. V. (5. 10a).

mithyopayojita (comp.) 'wrongly applied,' (med.) Suśr. (370).

LUDWIK STERNBACH

NEW YORK

Sources of Indian Tradition (Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies, Department of History, Columbia University, Number LVI); compiled by Wm. Theodore de Bary, Stephen Hay, Royal Weiler, Andrew Yarrow. Pp. xxvii + 961. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.

The publication of a book such as this implies the prior definition of a culture and some certain knowledge of its sources. It should be said at once that although many people could no doubt frame a more or less satisfactory definition of the Indian tradition, it is most doubtful whether any one scholar could have put together this collection with any pretense to authority—is there anyone even with adequate command of all the languages?—and further that the single view of one writer could presumably confer only a specious unity upon the complexity of Indian culture at the cost of partiality for some part or parts of it. The alternative chosen by the makers of this book is multiple authorship and some division of responsibility, with general adherence, apparently, to one definitive judgment of the essential in Indian tradition.

The purpose of the volume is "to provide the general reader with an understanding of the intellectual and spiritual traditions which remain alive in India and Pakistan today." This is more precise than the somewhat too abstract title *Sources of Indian Tradition*: there are, of course, several traditions in the history of India which have at times existed together and influenced one another but have yet remained apart, as the former all but complete eclipse of Buddhism and the present existence of the states of India and Pakistan eminently show.

The design of the book is that of an anthology with copious commentary. The preface makes note of the fact that "religion has furnished the categories" under which the subject is treated. There are six of these divisions: Brahmanism, by R. N. Dandekar, with an introduction by Royal Weiler; Jainism and Buddhism, by A. L. Basham; Hinduism, with several separate chapters by V. Raghavan and R. N. Dandekar and an introduction by Andrew Yarrow; Islam in Medieval India, by Peter Hardy; Sikhism, by J. B. Harrison; modern India and Pakistan, by Stephen Hay. The selection of texts is very heavily weighted in the direction of religion: about one half of them are, in fact, exclusively religious; and many of the others, although chosen from works ostensibly directed to clearly limited worldly aims (such as the attainment of political independence) display some fundamentally religious bias or are reasoned from the tenets of one of the religions of India.

The preface disclaims the implication of any judgment that "religion was always the dominant factor in Indian life" but defends the religious emphasis in the choice of readings by the assertion that "in the body of literature which provides us our texts, religious identities and continuities are more clearly distinguishable than are those based upon historical chronology or dynastic associations." This is true; and the book will for the most part be used by teachers capable of correcting this emphasis when such correction is necessary. Nevertheless, there remains the definite possibility that such a concentration of attention upon the history of religious thought may give a false image of India. To most people from the Western world India no doubt does first present itself as a culture steeped in religion (as China, by contrast, does not); but it should be remembered in this connection that to many Indians the proliferation of churches in the United States is an indication that our culture likewise is a deeply religious one (as it almost certainly is not). Further, there are elements in every great culture (and the Indian is no exception) which are simply non-religious; some of these, such as the formal element in verse, can be exemplified on the printed page; others, such as the dance and music, can only be described. Moreover, acceptance of an alien system of religious thought as a credible hypothesis is perhaps possible only in isolation and after prolonged study: so that this kind of understanding can hardly be fostered by a comparative anthology. Finally, also, it must be observed that parts of the civilization of India—and this, it is true, may be different from tradition—have been gradually shaped by actions just as important as ideas: by alliances among Mogul emperors and Rajput princes; by the building of roads and railways; by the playing of polo and of cricket; by the introduction of secular education; by the use of Persian and of English.

Since there is an increasing need for a book of this kind, and since this is a very good one, prospective readers should, therefore, be made aware

of what they should not expect to find. Consideration of the development and decline of Indian institutions does not appear in it except by indirect reference (as in the section on modern India and Pakistan): some of the prescripts for the ideal Muslim ruler are quoted, but such subjects as the actual practice of civil administration under the Mogul empire are not considered; and no part of the constitution of modern India is cited. Inasmuch as the book is, therefore, quite strictly limited to the tracing of the history of ideas, it may fairly be said to suffer from some of the weaknesses inherent in that rarified study. On the other hand, those willing for a time to accept the divorce of institutions and ideas will find the volume eminently useful. Some even of this latter group will, nevertheless, think the preoccupation with religion somewhat excessive and will regret the all but total exclusion (as non-traditional?) of the pride and pomp and wit and humor of ancient India.

The volume begins with Brahmanism. With the religious emphasis granted, it is good to observe that the essential oneness of Indian religious thought from the Rig-Veda through the Upanishads is stressed (". . . practically every basic idea expounded has its antecedent in earlier Vedic texts . . .") and to note that later this unfolding and developing yet still identical tradition is traced into the law books and into the revival of Hinduism in the nineteenth century. In the midst of such a surfeit of greatness as one finds in Indian religious and metaphysical speculation, it is essential that students be reminded that each of these classical moments is a part of Indian history which occurred as a specific event in time with a before and an after on Indian soil.

It is unfortunate, therefore, that more—one might almost say some—attention was not given to the Indus valley civilization and the residue of its culture possibly to be found in succeeding periods of Indian thought. Presumably because the editors judged this pre-Aryan culture to be no longer a living part of the intellectual and spiritual life of modern India or modern Pakistan, it has been dismissed as if because pre- it were thus non-Indian. Many will regret this judgment; and it is certainly an opportunity cast away almost carelessly. The Indus valley is part of the Indian sub-continent; its civilization is by general consent exciting because the remnants of its art (such as the male torsos and the dancer figurine) are peculiarly congenial to modern taste. To allot this epoch less than two pages out of nine hundred is a most curious decision. (Here it should be noted that Chapter 1, entitled *The Cosmic Order in the Vedic Hymns*, is anachronously adorned with a drawing of an Indus valley seal and Chapter 2, *The Ritual Order in the Brahmanas*, with a reproduction of the famous Mohenjo Daro statuette of the bearded man.)

The chapters on Hinduism are excellently arranged under the topical headings of *dharma*, *artha*, *kāma*, and *mokṣa*. *Mokṣa* receives the fullest treatment (twenty pages of songs by the medieval mystic-saints are happily included under this heading). *Kāma* is rather unsatisfactorily treated: a less determined delicacy would not have been amiss. In this section on Hinduism, moreover, a larger and different selection from the great epics could well have been given, some of the delightful short tales with shrewd and often inapposite morals could have been quoted, and a much larger and altogether different example of Kalidasa's genius should certainly have been chosen. One wonders, indeed, whether some accidental editorial excision or a mere oversight may not have been responsible for the extraordinarily inappropriate unique exemplification of the greatest Sanskrit poet in two short selections from the Raghuvaṃśa, neither of which by any extension of judgment could be called poetic in translation and one of which was chosen apparently only to support a footnote on ". . . the basic meaning of *kāma* . . . the king performed the sexual act not for its own sake. . . ." And where are the other great poets and dramatists? More than one small Indian boy has dreamed of palaces paved with gold and set with turqoise, emerald, and pearl. This splendor is part of the Indian—of the Hindu—tradition. It is not mentioned.

Basham's introduction to Buddhism and Jainism and his commentaries to the texts are vigorous, concise, and full of the sort of precise information (such as the meanings of unfamiliar terms) which a book such as this should in every instance provide. The discussion of *Paṭiccasamuppāda* is an example of thoughtful, careful, and simple explanation. The texts chosen for this section are ample. Here again, however, the splendor of the Buddhist era in India is not revealed at all. Those who know Basham's *The Wonder that was India* will regret the emphasis on theology.

The Mogul period and the events of 1857 and

after offer problems different in kind but analogous in their difficulty. Most students of India, whether Indian or foreign, know very little about the Moguls and almost nothing from primary sources; but nearly everyone knows the Mutiny from secondary British sources, and everyone has read *Kim*. There are worse ways to India than through the Taj Mahal or Kipling; but exact further knowledge of both the Moguls and the British in India is hard to present in a few pages and in a few selections from documents. Peter Hardy, dealing with the Moguls in accordance with the general plan of the book, has concentrated on the idea of *islām*, submission to the will of God, rather than on the tangible results of the long period of Mogul rule. He has, however, admirably summarized in eight pages the historical background and the coming of Islam to India.

Part Six, Modern India and Pakistan, occupies almost four hundred pages and takes the reader from the expansion of Europe and the opening of India to the West down through Rammohun Roy, Sir William Jones, Ramakrishna, Ranade and Gokhale, Tilak, Iqbal, Tagore, Gandhi, Jinnah, Nehru, and Vinoba Bhave. It is impossible to suppose that everyone will be satisfied with the selection made by Hay or with everything that he and Qureshi have to say; but the balance maintained is wholly admirable, the introductions are brief and eminently readable, and Qureshi's essays on the Muslim revival and the founding of Pakistan are reasoned, moderate, well-documented, and bound to be interesting to readers of this volume, whose primary interest is likely to be in India rather than in Pakistan.

In the maintaining of a nice balance between history and doctrine and theory and practice, J. B. Harrison's treatment of Sikhism is the best chapter in the book.

Whether this volume is exactly suited to the needs of the courses in Indian civilization now being developed in increasing numbers throughout the country, only a year's trial can really tell. It is unfortunate that more historical survey was not included than the lists of events which precede each of the sections, for it seems likely that supplementary material will be needed to fill in the whole background for the theory and the history of ideas here presented so fully and so well. Within its prescribed limits, however, there can be no question that the book is very good indeed.

With a book so excellent in appearance and so free of printing error, it is perhaps more than normally permissible to be captious of small faults. One of these which is particularly bothersome is the lack of continual definite ascription of particular responsibility for the many separate parts of the volume, both of translated text and of modern commentary. This is most irksome in a collection of translations by many hands; and it is particularly so here since the first paragraph of the Explanatory Note which sets out to provide just this information is both unclear and incorrect: the sources of the translation are not always given at the beginning of each selection (and had these original sources been given, still these "have sometimes been adapted or edited"); and "the list of sources at the end of the book" from which full bibliographical data is to be obtained is not a list of sources used for *this* book, since it cites not only editions of texts which may have been consulted but are not quoted, but also translations which, being in languages other than English, were not directly used either. In a second edition a complete list of translators, emendors of translations, and commentators should be given and the division of their responsibilities clearly stated.

The useful Indic word list could also be expanded to include Islamic terms.

MURRAY FOWLER

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

L'idéologie tripartie des Indo-Européens. By GEORGES DUMÉZIL. (Collection Latomus, Vol. XXXI.) Pp. 122. Bruxelles: LATOMUS REVUE D'ÉTUDES LATINES, 1958.

For more than twenty years Professor Dumézil has studied and compared the oldest traditions of the different peoples who spoke Indo-European languages, and by comparing these traditions he has come to the conclusion that these different peoples had a great store of common elements organized in complex structures, which are not to be found among the other peoples of antiquity. The present volume is an exposé of the most important of these structures, and it is also a good résumé of some of the principal results of Dumézil's research.

In the first chapter Professor Dumézil states the good reasons we have for believing that the tripartite social division (*i. e.*, the division in the three orders: priests, warriors, and agriculturists), which we find established in post-vedic India, and which certainly goes back to the time of the composition of the Vedic hymns, also existed not only among the Iranians of the time of the Avesta and among the Scythians, but also among the Ionians, among the Celts of the time of Caesar, and in prehistoric Rome. He also points out that this tripartite social division did not originally exist among the peoples of antiquity which were not Indo-Europeans. Although this last assertion is difficult to prove with certainty, the argumentation of the author, in this part of his work, is impressive and even convincing. The three social groups (priests, warriors, and agriculturists) represent the three 'fonctions,' *i. e.*, the three fundamental activities, namely: sacred science, power, and productivity (or wealth and fecundity); and several remarkable triads which are found among different Indo-European peoples, appear clearly as being related with these three fundamental activities. For instance: the three calamities (bad sacrifice, bondage, and bad food); the three crimes (*malum carmen, injuria,* and *furtum*); the three means of healing (incantations, incisions, and drugs); and the three objectives of man (*dharma, kāma,* and *artha*).

In the second and third chapters, Professor Dumézil examines the theologies, the mythologies, and the epic legends of the Indo-European peoples from the point of view of the tripartite ideology. Each of the three 'fonctions' is represented by a deity or a group of deities; and although these deities are different among the different Indo-European peoples, they show great similarities in their characters. In Vedic India the first 'fonction' is represented by the two sovereign gods Mitra and Varuṇa; the second by the warrior god Indra (often accompanied by another god, Vāyu, Agni, Sūrya, or Viṣṇu); and the third by the two Aśvins, the divine physicians, the bestowers of wealth and prosperity. And it is remarkable that, in the treaty that was concluded between the king of Mitanni and the Hittite king, circa 1380 B. C., the gods invoked by the king of Mitanni are Mitra and Varuṇa, Indra, and the two Nāsatyas.— In Iran, at the time of the Avesta, we find, in association with the great and unique god Ahura Mazda, six divine entities: Vohu Manah (Good Thought), Aśa (Order), Xśaθra (Power), Ārmaiti (Pious Thought), Haurvatāt (Health), and Amərətāt (Non-Death). Of these entities, the first two seem to correspond to the first 'fonction'; the third certainly corresponds to the second 'fonction'; and the last three probably to the third.— In Rome, in the most ancient period of its history, the three 'fonctions' are represented by Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus; and the three great priests of the state, the three *flamines majores,* are the *dialis,* the *martialis,* and the *quirinalis.* Jupiter is the protector of sacred order; Mars is the patron of strength; and it is probable that Quirinus, who later was considered as one of the two aspects of Mars, originally was the representative of the third 'fonction,' for he was associated with the goddess Ops (Abundance), and his principal festival coincided with the last act of the Fornacalia (the festival of the parching of the grains).

There is a triad of the same kind in the mythology of pagan Scandinavia. Ódinn, the powerful magician, who knows the runes, and is at the head of the gods, represents the first 'fonction'; Thórr, the god with the hammer, the enemy of the giants, represents the second; and Freyr who, with the other Vanir, furthers and protects fecundity, wealth and peace, represents the third.

Some of the most interesting paragraphs of the third chapter of Dumézil's work deal with Wikander's interpretation of the divine origin of the five Pāṇḍavas in the Mahābhārata. As a matter of fact, this remarkable interpretation corroborates some important points of Dumézil's theory of the

tripartite ideology of the Indo-Europeans. Yudhiṣṭhira, the virtuous and pious king, who is the son of Dharma, represents the first 'fonction'; Bhīma, the violent and terrible warrior, who is the son of Vāyu, and Arjuna, the great archer, who is the son of Indra, represent the second 'fonction' under two different aspects; and Nakula and Sahadeva, the beautiful and amiable twins, who are the sons of the two Aśvins, represent the third 'fonction.'

By comparing the legends of prehistoric Rome with some legends of pagan Scandinavia and with some Vedic myths, Dumézil draws our attention to remarkable coincidences, but, in several instances, his conclusions must be considered as only hypothetical. Nevertheless his general theory of the tripartite ideology of the Indo-Europeans seems well established and sound; and every scholar who is interested in the problems of Indo-European mythology and religion will be grateful to Professor Dumézil for the publication of this stimulating work.

In an appendix Professor Dumézil discusses the meaning of the Vedic god Aryaman. He vindicates his own interpretation against the criticism of Professor Thieme, and explains why he does not accept Thieme's interpretation. He particularly points out that Thieme did not sufficiently value the fact that, according to the Atharvaveda, Aryaman is invoked as the god "who seeks a husband for the unmarried girl and a wife for the bachelor." Discussions of this kind are certainly profitable; but moderation should be observed. The criticism of Professor Thieme was a little too aggressive, and we regret to note that there is some bitterness in Professor Dumézil's reply.

P.-E. DUMONT

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

Śūdras In Ancient India. (A Survey of the Position of the Lower Orders down to circa A.D. 500). By RAM SHARAN SHARMA. Pp. v + 318. Delhi-Varanasi-Patna: MOTILAL BANARSIDASS, 1958.

The aim of this scholarly and on the whole well organized book is to explain the position of the Śūdras in Vedic times, and then to trace the development of their status until the middle of the first millenium A.D. But, although the author's investigations do not extend to more recent times, the book will be of interest not only to historians, but also to those concerned with contemporary changes in the interrelations of the higher Indian castes and the castes still described by the generic term Śūdras.

In his speculation on the possible origin of the Śūdras the author seems to have started with the assumption that the members of the fourth varṇa were the descendants of a pre-Aryan indigenous population. The long discussion of the identity of Dāsas and Dasyus would otherwise have little bearing on the theme of the book, but it is useful to show how slender is the evidence for any equation of either of these populations with the lower orders of classical Vedic society. But neither seems there to be sufficient evidence for the author's suggestion that "in the course of time the majority of the Aryans could not escape the fate of being reduced to the position of commoners and helots" (p. 26). Such a hypothesis would seem to presuppose that in earlier times there were no status differentiations among the Aryan-speaking immigrants, and that those who later formed the peasantry had sunk down to this level from a more elevated position.

The author is probably right when he assumes that "from the Vedic period onwards large numbers of aborigines of varying stocks were successively incorporated in the Śūdra varṇa" (p. 29), but on the same page he speaks of a "Śūdra tribe," suggesting thereby that at one time the Śūdras were an ethnic group rather than a social class. The author reaffirms this assumption when he says that "the earlier opposition between Ārya and Dasa or Dasyu is replaced by one between Arya and Śūdra" (p. 31), but I frankly do not consider the evidence very convincing. For the Dasyus were clearly the enemies of Āryas in open battle, whereas the Śūdras, as the fourth varṇa, form part of Vedic society. This difficulty may be resolved to some extent, however, if we accept the author's view that, as suggested by the Mahā-

bhārata, there was a clear distinction between the Śūdra class and the Śūdra tribe.

Dr. Sharma sums up his discussion on "the origin of the Śūdra varṇa . . . by stating that large sections of people, Āryans and pre-Āryans, were reduced to this position, partly through external and partly through internal conflicts" (p. 40). This is not a very precise conclusion, and indeed I find it difficult to see how the data from early Sanskrit sources analysed in the preceding pages can add up even to as much as this. The author obviously realizes the inconclusive character of his material when he suggests that "the view that the Śūdra varṇa was made up of the pre-Āryans seems to be as one-sided and exaggerated as the view that they mainly consisted of the Āryan peoples" (p. 40).

But how are we to reconcile this noncommittal statement with the earlier much more definite statement: "It is . . . probable that the Śūdras came to India towards the end of the second millenium B. C., when they were defeated by the Vedic Āryans and were gradually absorbed into the later Vedic society as the fourth varṇa" (p. 35).

After the conflicting hypotheses and conjectures of the chapter on "Origin," which is undoubtedly the least successful, the author reaches very much firmer ground when in Chapter III, he analyses the position of Śūdras in later Vedic times (c. 1000-c. 600 B. C.). During this period Śūdras are mentioned as being independent farmers as well as domestic servants, labourers and even slaves. They could take part in various rituals and sacrifices, and both hypergamous and hypogamous unions between members of the higher varṇa and Śūdras were permissible. The comparably favourable position of the Śūdras in this period deteriorates, however, in the preMauryan period (c. 600-c. 300 B. C.) when they appear as a definitely underprivileged class. The author points out, however, that it is wrong to equate Śūdra with either slave or serf. Although some Śūdras were slaves others were free and there is no indication that Śūdra labourers were attached to the land and transferred with it in the fashion of agrestic serfs. Hypergamous marriages of high caste men with Śūdra women, though not considered desirable were still permitted, but the Dharmasūtras show great aversion for hypergamous unions. The Arthaśāstra of Kautilya contains a good deal of information on the position of Śūdras, and it seems that although varṇa-differentiation was maintained in legislation, the position of Śūdras, who could enroll in the army and be independent peasants, was not altogether unfavourable.

But the post-Mauryan period (c. 200 B. C.–c. A. D. 200) brought violent anti-Śūdra measures reflected in the laws of Manu, and what the author considers a time of "bitter varṇa-struggle," a term which is perhaps not very happy as it suggests almost an organized class struggle, while there can be no question of any political consciousness and concerted action of the widely differing castes embraced within the fourth varṇa. But the author makes an important point, when he emphasizes the rôle of the guilds of artisans in the improvement of the Śūdras' status in the Gupta period.

One wishes the author could have continued his study of the position of Śūdras into post-Gupta and even more recent times, for there is still an enormous gap between the picture emerging from classical sources, and the present situation. For the castes included in the Śūdra varṇa constitute today not only the majority of the independent peasantry, but even such well-situated castes as the Nayar are classed as Śūdras, and this suggests the relevance of the author's remark that already in the Gupta period the Śūdra and the Vaiśya varṇa had "practically lost their independent identities" (p. 282). Castes which appear today as "clean" Śūdras may thus be the outcome of such a merging of the two lower varṇas.

With his scholarly analysis of a vast mass of literary data, the author has not only made an important contribution to Indian social history, but has put into his debt also those who try to comprehend present-day social phenomena as the outcome of caste-attitudes which have crystallized in the distant past. To give only one example: the system of hypergamous inter-caste unions found today among the Hindu populations of Nepal resembles more closely the marriage customs of pre-Mauryan times than those prevailing in any part of present-day India, and a knowledge of its historical prototypes helps us to understand a situation which otherwise must appear strangely different from the familiar Indian pattern of inter-caste relations.

C. VON FÜRER-HAIMENDORF

SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL AND AFRICAN STUDIES,
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

Report on the Excavations at Nasik and Jorwe, 1950-51. By H. D. Sankalia and S. B. Deo. (Deccan College Monograph Series No. 13.) Pp. 178. Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute, 1955.

This account of excavations at Nasik and Jorwe, which lie in the uppermost Godavari river basin roughly 100 miles northeast of Bombay city, adds another useful chapter to the history of stratigraphic excavation in India.

The habitation mound at Nasik, into which several test pits were sunk, yielded cultural remains described as ranging from Chalcolithic to Moghul-Maratha. The earliest level is marked by microliths, including one trapeze, several lunates, fluted cores, and blades, and by yellow-ochre or orange colored hand and wheel made pottery sometimes painted with black or red bands. No metal was found here. This level is dated by the authors prior to 500 B.C. The second occupation level contains a considerable quantity of iron implements, Northern Black Polished pottery, the black and black-and-red "Megalithic" ware which occurs in megalithic structures down to the southern tip of the Indian peninsula, and coins which permit dating between 400 B.C. and 50 A.D. In later mixed levels at the site are found some sherds of Samian and other wares showing definite Roman contact between 50 and 200 A.D. Following this period, the site—insofar as dug—seems to have been abandoned and to have been reoccupied only in the Moghul-Maratha period between 1400 and 1875 A.D. Glazed and celadon pottery wares, polychrome glass ornaments, and a coin of the Moghul emperor Akhbar help date the finds here.

At Jorwe five small pits were sunk to depths of six to nine feet into what appeared to the excavators to be a one-period site containing microliths and red, black, and tan pottery. Thick wares were sometimes decorated with stamped and incised designs while thin red wares were painted in black linear and geometric horizontal panels. Unfortunately, the pottery from four stratigraphically observable layers was subsequently mixed up and detailed study thereby made impossible. This is particularly unfortunate since six bronze axe heads reportedly were found—presumably by local villagers—in an otherwise undescribed painted pot at Jorwe prior to the date of the excavations. Similarities between pottery and microliths suggest to the authors that Jorwe can be correlated in date with the lowest level at Nasik.

One important aspect of the excavations at Nasik is that they, like a few others before them, at last are beginning to show the relative temporal relationships between artifacts which until the 1930s had few known cultural associations and virtually no chronological ties. Microliths are now being proven to occur in early horizons in several parts of India, although their absolute dates are still unclear. The tantalizing report of a find of bronze axeheads in a painted pot at Jorwe suggests that further excavations could clear up some of the mystery surrounding finds of this type of implement elsewhere in India. The cultural associations of the numerous finds of these artifacts which occur in many parts of central India are one of the most elusive elements in Indian archaeology.

Another useful service of recent stratigraphic excavation in India is the pinning down of supposedly "prehistoric" megaliths containing abundant iron goods and red-and-black pottery to a period close to the beginning of the Christian era. Though the dates of these megaliths and their characteristic pottery may well vary considerably in various parts of India, further excavation should result in these readily recognizable archaeological features becoming a really useful time-culture indicator. Nasik, being a habitation rather than a burial site, should be an informative one if enough of it could be excavated to give a reliable cross-section of the material culture of the people inhabiting it. The crying need at the moment appears to be sufficient funds fully to excavate a few key sites where the whole scope of certain material cultures might be revealed. As yet, early Indian levels in the date period between 500 and 1500 B.C. are uncovered in such limited trenching that only fragmentary conclusions can be drawn. Jorwe, for instance, seems an unusually promising site for excavation of a "microlithic" culture. Some obvious differences in finds at Jorwe and Nasik, however, suggest that the stratigraphy of that site should be more closely studied.

The common method used by the authors of publishing finds by category—*i.e.*, stone, bone, iron, pottery—regardless of stratigraphic relationships makes it difficult for the reader to determine what articles were found associated in any given level. The authors, however, have provided a con-

siderable number of valuable illustrations and descriptions of their finds. More detailed comparison of shapes and designs of pottery, iron implements, beads, and other materials with surface finds and excavated artifacts from other parts of India would have made the present publication a more scholarly work. It would also have made it easier for Western scholars, some of whom do not have ready access to early Indian archaeological publications, to relate the present excavations with others. The museums of India abound in material which could be cross-checked with profit now that stratigraphy is being established at some key points.

EUGENE C. WORMAN, JR.
McLEAN, VIRGINIA

A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa. By W. PACHOW. Pp. 253. Santiniketan: THE SINO-INDIAN CULTURAL SOCIETY, 1955.

This work is Dr. Pachow's dissertation written for the University of Bombay. It is dedicated to Prof. T'an Yün-Shan for his selfless service and devotion to promoting Sino-Indian studies and renewing the cultural interchange between India and China. The main text is divided into two parts: an introduction (pp. 2-68) and a comparison of the *prātimokṣa* rules of the various schools (pp. 69-219). Dr. Pachow thinks that the Prātimokṣa is one of the oldest texts in the Buddhist canon and the oldest text also in the Vinayapiṭaka and that its significance and importance to the students of ancient Indian history and culture is manifold, though primarily it is a collection of liturgical formularies governing the conduct of the monks and nuns. He has stated that the Prātimokṣa text and its commentaries furnish us with a distinct picture of the social, political, economic, and religious conditions that must have prevailed in the time of the Buddha, that is, about the fifth century B. C. (*Study*, p. 3). However, Dr. Pachow's *Study* is mainly a comparison of the *prātimokṣa* rules only for monks (not for nuns), and it has not made extensive use of the numerous commentaries on Prātimokṣa which are preserved in Chinese and Tibetan. Furthermore, he has failed to devote special chapters in his introduction to discussing the social, political, economic and religious life during the time of the Buddha, which, as he claims, is reflected in the *prātimokṣa* rules.

In the first subdivision of his introduction, Dr. Pachow has discussed the meaning *of prātimokṣa* and concluded: "Taking all the aforesaid data into consideration, we are inclined to believe that there used to be two different interpretations of the word *prātimokṣa*. It has been interpreted as 'deliverance' on the one hand, the 'chief' or the 'principal' on the other. These two seem to have taken the word *mukha* and the root *muc* respectively for the purpose of derivation current at the same time. The suggestion made by H. Kern that *prātimokṣa* was taken in the sense of 'cuirass,' or 'something serving as a (spiritual) cuirass' does not appear to us to be convincing, because so many texts of the northern tradition as we have seen above, clearly and undoubtedly, base their explanations on the root *muc* in spite of the fact that Dr. S. Dutt seeks to defend that explanation. He quotes Amarakoṣa to strengthen his assertion, but immediately confesses that he has not been able to discover any instance of the use of the word precisely in that sense in Sanskrit." (*Study*, pp. 6-7).

In his second subdivision of the introduction which deals with the number, date, and authorship of the *prātimokṣa* rules, Dr. Pachow has assumed that the earliest part of these rules should reach far back to the neighborhood of 500 B. C., and that the final shape of the Pali and the Mahāsāṅghika texts may at most take a hundred years to undergo their fullest development, including the Śaikṣa dharmas. Furthermore, he has speculated that the latest date of the recension of the Prātimokṣa text cannot possibly be placed after 272 B. C. or just before Aśoka's coronation in 269 B. C. (*Study*, p. 17).

In the third subdivision of his introduction, where the councils of Rājagṛha, Vaiśāli, and Pāṭaliputra are discussed, Dr. Pachow has expressed the opinion that some of the rules, at least, had existed before the council of Rājagṛha took place

(*Study*, p. 23), and that at the time of the council of Vaiśāli, the Prātimokṣa was in its fully developed stage and the minute regulations regarding the daily activities of the Saṅgha as found in the Sutta-vibhaṅga and the bulk of the Khandakas had also emerged into existence (*Study*, p. 27).

In the fourth subdivision — Texts and the Schools—, Dr. Pachow has presumed that the split of the schools was caused by difference of doctrine rather than those of discipline (*Study*, p. 32). He is inclined to think that there might be two Second Councils with an historical basis: one being held from the viewpoint of Vinaya and the other from that of the doctrine (*Study*, p. 33). He has stated that at the beginning when the rules were in the making, there had not been any ready-made sections as we see them now, and that when the bulk of the proclaimed regulations had grown in size, the compilers thought it necessary to classify them into different groups and sections according to the nature of the offense, the gravest one on the top and the lighest at the end (*Study*, pp. 37-8). Then he mentions the eight sections of the rules and he finds the classification unsatisfactory (*Study*, p. 38). Dr. Pachow has divided the existing Prātimokṣa texts into four groups: (1) The Mahāsāṅghika, the Upāliparipṛcha, and the Pali; (2) The Kaśyapīya, the Mahīśāsaka, and the Dharmaguptaka; (3) the Mūlasarvāstivāda (including the Chinese and Tibetan translations, and also the list in the Mahāvyutpatti); (4) The Sarvāstivāda (including the Sanskrit and Chinese translations). He thinks that the Mahāsāṅghika text has preserved older forms of the original Prātimokṣa better than any other school including the Sthaviravāda, and that the Sarvāstivāda text represents the most advanced and developed version. A chart showing the relation of the Prātimokṣa text and the schools is presented on page 44 in Dr. Pachow's Study.

The fifth subdivision of the introduction, Differences of Interpretation, where Dr. Pachow has discussed only a few expressions—*sabhojane kule, aniṣkrānte rājñi anirgṛhīteṣu ratneṣu, antargṛha,* and *bījagrāmabhūtagrāma*—should be expanded. We are told by Vinitadeva that the Sarvāstivādins, the Mahāsāṅghikas, the Sammitīyas, and the Sthaviravādins used the following four Indic languages, *viz.*, Sanskrit, Prakrit, Apabhraṃśa and Paiśāci, respectively, in recording their literature. However, the extant Prātimokṣa texts are in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit and in Pali. The Chinese Tripiṭaka contains different recensions of the Prātimokṣa text of various schools, and the Tibetan Tripiṭaka has the text of the Mūlasarvāstivādins.

Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit has been extensively and systematically studied by Professor Franklin Edgerton. His monumental work—*BHS Grammar and Dictionary*, published in 1955—has already been accepted by scholars as the standard reference book. However, there are still many BHS expressions whose meaning can be further clarified by examining their counterparts in Chinese and Tibetan translations. Prof. Edgerton has consulted only a few Tibetan translations of the BHS works, and he has made very few quotations from Chinese sources. Dr. Pachow has studied all the Chinese and Tibetan recensions of the Prātimokṣa text and has compared in great detail these monastic rules. Unfortunately, interesting discussions are buried in the second part of his *Study* where the complete text is compared.

The sixth subdivision of the introduction deals extensively with the discrepancies in the section of Śaikṣa dharmas in the texts of the various schools.

In the seventh subdivision of the introduction, Dr. Pachow has attempted to trace the Prātimokṣa's external influences and to discuss its function. "The tradition of observing the Darśapūrṇamāsa Sacrifice and the sacred day Upavastha connected with it, on the full and new moon days, by the Brāhmaṇas and Śramaṇas of ancient India is undoubtedly of great antiquity" (p. 59). "It is quite possible that the Buddhists derived their inspiration for their fortnightly recitation of the *prātimokṣa* rules from such practices, though the function in the latter case is entirely different" (p. 59). "Amongst the important cardinal rules in Buddhism in general, and in Prātimokṣa in particular, the observance of Brahmacarya or celibacy, and the Five Precepts of good conduct were adopted from the Brāhmanical Code beyond any shadow of doubt" (p. 61). "Besides, we find a large number of rules of the Prātimokṣa bearing a striking resemblance to that of the Sacred Laws mentioned in the works of Āpastamba and Gautama as well as in the Jain Sūtras. Both the Buddhists and the Jains might have directly borrowed some rules from the ancient Brāhmanical Law Codes to suit their own purpose" (p. 62). "The growth of the Prātimokṣa has been nourished by two vital

streams: one is the Brāhmanical tradition, and the other is the public censure or opinion" (p. 65). After a brief survey of the 263 rules in the Sarvāstivāda Prātimokṣa that govern the action of the monks (p. 66) and the five punishments on the culprits (p. 67), Dr. Pachow has drawn the following conclusion: "The function of the Prātimokṣa is clear enough that it legally governs the actions of the monks (and the nuns), maintains peace and unity in the Saṅhga, and has the right to impose penalties on the culprits. Religiously, it retains the ancient traditional custom of observing the new and full moon day celebrations" (p. 67).

The main body of the Comparative Study is the translation and discussions of the Prātimokṣa rules. Dr. Pachow first presents an English translation of the Chinese Sarvāstivāda text. Under each rule he discusses the discrepancies in the corresponding item in the Sanskrit Sarvāstivāda text, the Pali text, the Chinese texts of the Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka Kāśyapīya, Mahāsāṅghika, Mūlasarvāstivāda schools, the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivāda Prātimokṣa text and also the list of offenses preserved in the Mahāvyutpatti where BHS and Tibetan expressions are given together with Chinese and Japanese translations.

The appendices—classification of the *prātimokṣa* rules of the Sarvāstivādin School, *pātayantika* rules not found in the Sarvāstivāda text but found in other texts, classification of the Śaikṣa dharmas of the Sarvāstivādin School, concordance tables of the *prātimokṣa* rules—are very useful. The index has not covered all the Sanskrit and Pali words mentioned in the work. There are many more errors than those listed in the Corrections and Additions which occupy the last few pages.

After a thorough investigation of the entire body of Chinese sources, I have compiled the following list of BHS expressions together with their counterpart in the Chinese texts with the intention of affirming the meaning assigned by Prof. Edgerton in his BHS Dictionary.

	BHS Dict.	*Chinese Prātimokṣa texts*					
		SV	DH	MSG	MHS	MSV	KSY
akṛtanirikta	299b	v. 34	v. 35	v. 33	v. 35	v. 34	
acelaka	7a	v. 44	v. 41	v. 52	v. 40	v. 44	v. 44
anavapṛchya	73a	v. 80	v. 83	v. 80	v. 83	v. 80	v. 80
anudhvaṁśayet	28a	ii. 8	ii. 8	ii. 8	ii. 8	ii. 8	ii. 8
		v. 69	v. 80	v. 90	v. 75	v. 69	v. 58
anupasampana	30a	v. 54	v. 5	v. 42	v. 7	v. 54	v. 54
anupraskandya	31b	v. 17	v. 16	v. 17	v. 17	v. 17	v. 16
antarāyikā dharmāḥ	39a	v. 55	v. 68	v. 45	v. 48	v. 55	v. 55
anyatra vijñapuraṣāt	486b	v. 5	v. 9	v. 5	v. 4	v. 5	v. 5
apārājikīyaṃ bhikṣum	46b	ii. 8	ii. 8	ii. 8	ii. 8	ii. 8	ii. 8
abhyavakāśa	60b-1a	v. 29	v. 45		v. 44		
amūlaka	63b	v. 69	v. 80	v. 90	v. 75	v. 69	v. 58
avadhyānakṣepaṇāt	72b,	v. 12	v. 13	v. 13	v. 13	v. 12	v. 12
	201a	vii. 85	vii. 34	vii. 42	vii. 80	vii. 65	vii. 66
asti hārake	619b	iv. 16	iv. 16			iv. 16	iv. 16
ātmoddeśikaṃ kuṭim	130b	ii. 6	ii. 6	ii. 6	ii. 6	ii. 6	ii. 6
āsādanaprekṣī	111a	v. 35	v. 36	v. 34	v. 36	v. 35	
indrakīla	114b	v. 82	v. 81	v. 82	v. 65	v. 82	v. 82
utkoṭayet	121b	v. 4	v. 66	v. 4	v. 5	v. 4	v. 4
udguṇṭhikā	129b	vii. 31	vii. 7	vii. 7	vii. 43	vii. 15	vii. 21
aphāṣam	49b	v. 62	v. 63	v. 62	v. 52	v. 62	v. 62
upanidadhyād upanidhāpayet perhaps read *apa-* for *upa-*	137a	v. 67	v. 58	v. 64	v. 78	v. 67	v. 67
upaśrutika	141b	v. 76	v. 77	v. 78	v. 60	v. 76	v. 76
upasampādayet	147a-b	v. 72	v. 65	v. 71	v. 61	v. 72	v. 72
kaṇḍupraticchādana	362b	v. 88	v. 88	v. 87	v. 88	v. 88	v. 88
kāḍa	176a	iv. 12	iv. 12	iv. 11	iv. 22	iv. 12	iv. 12
kāyasaṃsagga	178a	ii. 2	ii. 2	ii. 2	ii. 2	ii. 2	ii. 2
kuladūṣaka	188a	ii. 12	ii. 12	ii. 13	ii. 13	ii. 12	ii. 12
kaukṛtyam upasaṃharet	142a-b	v. 62	v. 63	v. 62	v. 52	v. 62	v. 62
	195b						
kṣudrakānukṣudrakaiḥ śikṣāpadaiḥ	200b	v. 10	v. 72	v. 10	v. 10	v. 10	v. 10
	527b						

	BHS Dict.	*Chinese Prātimokṣa texts*					
		SV	DH	MSG	MHS	MSV	KSY
khādanīyabhojanīya	204b	v. 37	v. 37	v. 36	v. 38	v. 37	v. 37
	412b						
cetanaka	232b	iv. 8	iv. 8	iv. 8	iv. 8	iv. 8	iv. 8
chorayiṣyāmaḥ	236b-237a	vii. 88	vii. 48	vii. 47	vii. 76	vii. 67	vii. 69
jihvāniścārakam	306b	vii. 76		vii. 28	vii. 73	vii. 58	vii. 53
jīvitapariṣkāra	244a	v. 67			v. 78	v. 67	v. 67
	331a						
tālapatra	252b	vii. 5			vii. 4	vii. 6	vii. 5
nipanna	297a	vii. 94	vii. 87	vii. 49	vii. 89	vii. 74	vii. 75
nivāsayiṣyāmaḥ	306a	vii. 1			vii. 1	vii. 1	vii. 1
niṣīdanasaṃstra	308a	iv. 15	iv. 15	iv. 15	iv. 25	iv. 15	iv. 14
niṣṭhitacīvara	308b	iv. 1	iv. 1	iv. 1	iv. 1	iv. 1	iv. 1
durvarṇīkaraṇa	267a-b	iv. 15	iv. 15	iv. 15	iv. 25	iv. 15	
		v. 59	v. 60	v. 48	v. 77	v. 58	v. 68
duṣṭhulam āpattim	97b,	v. 8	v. 7	v. 8	v. 9	v. 7	v. 8
	267b	v. 50	v. 64	v. 60	v. 74	v. 50	v. 50
dhāvayet	285a	iv. 5	iv. 5	iv. 5	iv. 5	iv. 4	iv. 5
pariḍāghasamayaḥ	325a	v. 60	v. 56	v. 50	v. 70		v. 70
bhikṣuṇīparipācita	326b	v. 30	v. 29	v. 30	v. 30	v. 30	v. 30
pracālaka	357b	v. 47	etc.				
praṇītabhojana	360b	v. 40	v. 40	v. 39	v. 41	v. 40	v. 40
pratideśayitavyam	363b	iv. 1	iv. 1	iv. 1	iv. 1		iv. 1
pratiṣevataḥ	373a	v. 55	v. 68	v. 45		v. 55	v. 55
pramāṇikam puṭim kārayīta	383a	ii. 6	ii. 6	ii. 6	ii. 6	ii. 6	ii. 6
phāṣakam	396b	v. 51	v. 46	v. 44	v. 76	v. 51	v. 52
bhaṇḍana	405b	v. 76	v. 77	v. 78	v. 60	v. 76	v. 76
bhūyaskāmatā	411b	vii. 83	vii. 33	vii. 45	vii. 77	vii. 49	vii. 43
mahallaka	421b	ii. 7	ii. 7	ii. 7	ii. 7	ii. 7	ii. 7
varṣāśāṭicīvara	472b	iv. 28	iv. 27	iv. 25	iv. 17	iv. 28	iv. 27
		v. 87	v. 89	v. 88	v. 89	v. 89	v. 89
vitapanaprekṣī	487a	v. 52	v. 57	v. 41	v. 68	v. 52	v. 53
vyavalokayiṣyāmaḥ	516a	vii. 85	vii. 34	vii. 42	vii. 80	vii. 65	vii. 66
śiṣṭavikiram	353a, 480b, 529a	vii. 80	vii. 40	vii. 40	vii. 59		
śukravisarga	530a	ii. 1	ii. 1	ii. 1	ii. 1	ii. 1	ii. 1
saṃcintya	550b	i. 3	i. 3			i. 3	i. 3
		ii. 1	ii. 1	ii. 1	ii. 1	ii. 1	ii. 1
saprāṇaka	391a	v. 19	v. 19	v. 19		v. 19	v. 19
samagra	560b	ii. 10	ii. 10	ii. 10	ii. 10	ii. 10	ii. 10
samatīrthika	561b	vii. 64	vii. 27, 28		vii. 52	vii. 40	vii. 41
saṃprajānamṛṣavāda	577a	v. 1	v. 1	v. 1	v. 1	v. 1	v. 1
sāntarottara	591a	iv. 7		iv. 7	iv. 7	iv. 7	
sūcīghara	604b	v. 67	v. 58	v. 64	v. 78		
sūpika	605a	vii. 63					vii. 46
skambhākṛta	608a	vii. 35	vii. 12	vii. 10	vii. 29	vii. 18	vii. 23
		vii. 97	vii. 56			vii. 81	
hastasaṃlagnikā	539a	vii. 55			vii. 25	vii. 29	vii. 28
hāsyaprekṣya	394b	v. 66				v. 66	v. 66
		v. 67	v. 58	v. 64	v. 78		v. 67

Discussions should be made for the following expressions which are interesting for various reasons:

1. *aṅgulipratodana* (*BHS Dict.* 374a) "poking with fingers, tickling." This meaning is not universally expressed in the Chinese translations. SV. v. 63. "poking pressingly with fingers"; DH. v. 53. "knocking with fingers"; MSG. v. 67. "pointing with fingers"; MHS. v. 54. "knocking"; MSV. v. 63. "knocking with fingers"; KSY. v. 63. "knocking." The Chinese expressions *chi* and *li* in DH. v. 53, MHS. v. 54, MSV. v. 63, and KSY. v. 63 are given as synonyms in a Chinese lexicon, *Po Ya*. Dr. Pachow's translation for *li* as "search" is not correct (*Study*, p. 156).

2. *atyastikā* (*BHS Dict.* 10b) "a certain posture, presumably of the hands." All the Chinese translations (SV. vii. 43, 101; MHS. vii. 17, 94; MSV. vii. 17, 80) are substantially the same: "tucking up the robe on the left and the right side, that is, on both shoulders" (cf. *paryastikā*).

3. *aniṣkrānte rājñi anirgṛhīteṣu ratneṣu* (*Study*, pp. 46-7). The Chinese translations show a great discrepancy which is indicated in the following chart:

"before the rise of the dawn"	"the king has not yet come out"	"jewels (and jewel-like articles) have not yet been stored away (by the queen)"
SV. v. 82		SV. v. 82
MSV. v. 82		MSV. v. 82
KSY. v. 80	KSY. v. 80	
	DH. v. 81	DH. v. 81
	MHS. v. 65	MHS. v. 65
		MSG. v. 82

Dr. Pachow thinks that this confusion is due to the misunderstanding of the Indic words: *ratna* "jewel," *rājñī* "queen," and *rajanī* "night."

4. *anutkṣiptacakṣuṣaḥ* (*MHS Dict.* 122a, also 70a-b). There are two BHS expressions: *avakṣipta* and *utkṣipta*. The former corresponds to Pali *avakkhitta* or *okkhitta*, meaning "downcast"; the latter, Professor Edgerton thinks, is a falsely Sanskritized form of the Middle Indic *okkhitta*. However, in the BHS Prātimokṣa, it is the negative form, *anutkṣipta*, which corresponds to the Pali *okkhitta*. This negative form can be interpreted in the meaning of ordinary Sanskrit "not lifted up (eyes)," namely "downcast." The old commentary on the Pali Vinaya rules interprets *okkitta* by observing that it is a sin to enter a house or sit down looking around at this or that. The different Chinese Prātimokṣa texts contain the following relevant rules with regard to the manners of entering and sitting down in a layman's house: "without casting glances" (SV. vii. 21); "without looking left or right" (DH. vii. 20; MSV. vii. 37; KSY. vii. 10); "looking properly or mindfully" (MSG. vii. 4); "with eyes not lifted up" (MHS. vii. 25; MSV. vii. 14); "without presumption" (SV. vii. 25; KSY. vii. 16).

5. *āhāryapādaka* (*BHS Dict.* 112b) "(a couch or seat) having removable (or more literally insertable?) legs." The Chinese texts offer two different explanations: "with sharp-pointed legs" (SV. v. 18; MSG. v. 18; MHS. v. 18); and "with removable legs" (for this Dr. Pachow has "with broken legs") (DH. v. 18; MSV. v. 18; KSY. v. 18).

6. *utkṛṣṭikā* (*BHS Dict.* 121b) probably "cocking or throwing back or up (of the head)." Professor Edgerton's definition is mainly based on the second Tibetan expression given under *utkṛṣṭikā* (Mvy. no. 8541): *mgo mi g-yog* "with head not covered," or *mgo mi rdze* "cocking of the head." The first Tibetan expression *mgo mi g-yog* should be the counterpart of BHS. *udguṇṭhika* (Mvy. 8540). The meaning of the Tibetan expression *rdze* "tuck up (clothes)" suggests the right interpretation of *utkṛṣṭikā* which is preserved in the Chinese translations: "tucking up the robe on one side (either on the left or the right side) (SV. vii. 41, 100; DH. vii. 3, 52; MSG. vii. 8; MHS. vii. 13, 15, 93; MSV. vii. 16, 79; KSY. vii. 19)." The appearance of *mgo* before *mi rdze* under Mvy. no. 8541 is peculiar.

7. *uddhṛta* (*BHS Dict.* 130b) ppp. of *uddharati* "suspends, stops, cancels (the *kaṭhina* ceremony)." The vague Chinese translations can hardly contribute anything to the interpretation of the BHS expression: "(the *kaṭhina* robe) is out (offered)" (DH. iv. 1; MSV. iv. 1; KSY. iv. 1); and "(the *kaṭhina* robe) has been given away" (MSG. iv. 1; MHS. iv. 1).

8. *upānaham* (*BHS Dict.* 146a) "sandal." This item is mentioned only in the SV. v. 67 together with "key." Three other texts (DH. v. 58; MSG. v. 64; MHS. v. 78) have "mat" (BHS *niṣīdanam*) instead.

9. *kalāpaka* (*BHS Dict.* 172a) "perhaps 'in fold.'" This meaning is supported by the Chinese translations which mean 'in fine fold.' (SV. vii, 8; MHS. vii. 7).

10. *kavaḍacchedakam* (*BHS Dict.* 174a) "adv. (in the manner of) dividing morsels (of food)." "Bite the food by halves" is given in the Chinese texts (SV. vii. 72; KSY. vii. 54; MSG. vii. 32; MHS. vii. 70; MSV. vii. 57).

11. *kāḍiśama* (*BHS Dict.* 176a) "some kind of dark color." Most of the Chinese translations for this expression are *Mu lan*, a certain kind of tree whose bark was used as material for dyeing red color. (SV. v. 59; DH. v. 60; MSG. v. 48; MHS. v. 77; KSY. v. 68). The corresponding Chinese expression in MSV. v. 58 is "red color." This plant is identified with Sanskrit *gandha*, and its botanical name is *Hyperanthera moringa*. (cf. Mochizuki Shinkō, *Dictionary of Buddhism*, enlarged edition, Tokyo, 1958, p. 997a).

12. *kāyaparicaryām* (*BHS Dict.* 322a) "service of the body, with special reference to sexual enjoyment." This special implication is only expressed in some of the following Chinese translations: "offering one's own body for service" (SV. ii. 4; MSG. ii. 4); "body" (DH. ii. 4; MHS. ii. 4; MSV. ii. 4; KSY. ii. 4).

13. *gaṇabhojana* (BHS Dict. 208a) "nt. eating in a group." The Chinese corresponding expressions "*pieh* (separate) *chung* (group) *shih* (eat)" (SV. v. 36; DH. v. 33; MSG. v. 40; MSV. v. 36; KSY. v. 36) and "*shou* (receive) *pieh* (separate) *ch'ing* (invitation) *chung* (group) *shih* (eat)" (MHS. v. 32) are intelligible only to those who are versed in the Buddhistic Chinese.

14. *duṣṭhulayā vācā* (*BHS Dict.* 268a) special meaning: "with lewd words (making sexual advances to a woman)"; standard meaning: "with gravely evil words." Most of the Chinese translations imply the special meaning.

"lewd"	"rough"	"immoral"
SV. ii. 3	SV. ii. 3	SV. ii. 3
DH. ii. 3	DH. ii.3	
KSY. ii. 3	KSY. ii. 3	
MSV. II. 3		
	MHS. ii. 3	
"ugly"	"vulgar"	"improper"
	KSY. ii. 3	KSY. ii. 3
MSG. ii. 3		

15. *paraṃparabhojana* (*BHS Dict.* 319b) "nt. eating (alms-food, on the part of monks) in (chosen) sequence, by (chosen) turns." The Chinese translations indicate that this MHS expression might mean "eating repeatedly at various places." (*Shu shu shih*, SV. v. 31; MHS. v. 31; *chan chuan shih*, DH. v. 32; MSV. v. 31; KSY. v. 31; *ch'u ch'u shih*, MSG. v. 31).

16. *parastikā*, according to the Tibetan definition given in Mvy. 8544, 8610, seems to mean "tucking up (the robe) onto two shoulders" (cf. *atyastikā*).

17. (*tataḥ paścāt*) *pratyuddhārya paribhuṃjīta* (*BHS Dict.* 378a), gerund of *pratyuddharati*, "having taken back." Pachow's emendation *a-prati-* is not warranted. The Chinese translations vary according to different schools. SV. v. 68, "to use (the robe)"; DH. v. 59, "to put on (the robe) without informing the owner"; MSG. v. 63, "to receive (the robe) and use it after it has been properly given away"; MHS. v. 81, "to take (the robe) back by force"; MSV. v. 68, "to wear (the robe) without asking for the owner's permission"; v. 59, "to use (the robe) without asking for permission."

18. *bījagrāmabhūtagrāmapātanāt* (*BHS Dict.* 410a-b) "destroys all sorts of vegetables." None of the Chinese translations, except SV, has grasped the true meaning of the BHS expression: *bhūta* 'vegetable.' SV. v. 11, "destroys grass and trees"; DH. v. 11, "destroys the village of ghost and spirit"; MSG. v. 11, "destroys seeds and village of the ghost"; MHS. v. 11, "attacks the village of the ghost"; MSV. v. v. 11, "destroys seeds and a village of living beings"; KSY. v. 11, "destroys seeds and village of the ghost."

19. *vārūḍhacīvara* (*BHS Dict.* 456b) occurs in a series of expressions in connection with robes: *ācchinnacīvaro vā naṣṭacīvaro vā dagdhacīvaro vārūḍhacīvaro vā*. Neither *rūḍha-* nor *ārūḍha-* seems to make any possible sense. Professor Edgerton thinks that this expression should be either emended to *vā ūḍha-*, or understood as *vā-r-ūḍha-* with hiatus-bridging *-r-*. From the Pali counterpart, *udakena vā vuḷham*, and the Chinese translations (SV. iv. 6; DH. iv. 6; MHS. iv. 6; MSV. iv. 6; KSY. iv. 6), we definitely know that this word should have the meaning: "the robe is carried away by water."

20. *vikṣiptikā* (*BHS Dict.* 482a) "a certain posture (of the hands?)." The Chinese translation means "letting the robe fall down" (cf. SV. vii. 45, 46, 102).

21. *viḍaṅgikā* (*BHS Dict.* 486b-7a), according to Tibetan *mdon* (*'dom*) *mi snang* and also Chinese and Japanese definitions on Mvy. 8563, means: "showing the private parts." However, three corresponding Chinese translations of the Prātimokṣa have the meaning: "walking on one's toes" (MSG. vii. 9; MHS. vii. 41, 42; MSV. vii. 21); SV. vii. 57, 58; *P'i hsing* "walking not efficiently"; KSY. vii. 29: *Yi tsu hsing*, meaning not clear; Finot's mistaken report on Chinese Prātimokṣa "bending one's leg," is quoted by Professor Edgerton and also by Dr. Pachow.

22. *vinyastikā* (*BHS Dict.* 490b) "a certain posture (of the hands?)" seems to be related to *udvyastikā* (Mvy. 8543) and *vyastikā* (Mvy. 8609). The information in Sakaki's edition of Mahāvyutpatti, which is not always reliable, should be used with caution. Here is a typical example which demonstrated he poor quality of this work.

BHS. *nodvyastikā* (Mvy. 8543)
Tib. *gnya gong du mi bsnol* (meaning unclear)
Chin. "with hands not joined at the back of the neck"
Jap. "not with arms akimbo" (cf. BHS. *skambhākṛta*; SV. vii. 35; MSV. vii. 18)

BHS. *vyastikākṛtāya* (Mvy. 8609)
Tib. *gnya gong du bsnol ba la* (meaning unclear)
Chin. "(A monk) should not preach to a person who has wrapped his head with a robe" (cf. BHS. *veṣṭitaśirasa*; SV. vii. 96; MSV. vii. 92)
Jap. "(A monk) should not preach to a person who has his arms akimbo" (cf. SV. vii. 97)

BHS. *na skambhākṛta* (Mvy. 8549)
Tib. *dkur ma brten, dkur mi bsten* (cf. Jäschke, *Dict.* 10a: *dkur rten pa*, "to carry a thing at one's side")
Chin. "(One) should not have his arms akimbo"
Jap. "(One) should not force one's body into a layman's house" (*nu shen*) (MSV. vii. 24).

This kind of confusion leads us to think that the Mahāvyutpatti should be carefully reedited.

23. *vyutkhaṇḍaśaḥ* (*BHS Dict.* 519a) "literally with open throat or out-stretched neck" seems to correspond to Pali *avagaṇḍakārakam* "so as to fill the cheeks with food." For the latter there are the following Chinese translations (DH. vii. 41; MSG. vii. 27; MHS. vii. 69; MSV. vii. 56): "to cause the cheeks to be swelled with food." SV. vii. 75 *wei* (not yet) *yen* (to swallow) *shih* (food) means that (the monk) should not eat more before he has swallowed the food (already in his mouth).

24. *sabhojane kule* (*BHS Dict.* 412b) "at a house where sexual intercourse is going on or about to be practiced." This specific meaning is not expressed in the Chinese translations: SV. v. 42: "of a house where a meal is going on"; DH. v. 43: "a place

where valuable articles are kept in a house in which a meal is going on"; MSG. v. 54; MSV. v. 42; KSY. v. 43: "a place where (the monk) knows people of the family are eating."

25. *samasūpikam piṇḍapātam* (*BHS Dict.* 344b, 345a, 567a) "alms-food having curry (sauce) equal to the rice in amount. This must be taken to mean 'having sauce in the right amount, which, according to the Pali commentary 892.1, is one-quarter of the rice.'" However, none of the Chinese translations supports the Pali commentary. SV. vii. 65, DH. vii. 29, MSG. vi. 25: "eating equal amounts of sauce and rice"; MHS. vii. 53: "eating both sauce and rice."

26. *hastāvalehakam* (*BHS Dict.* 74a) "adv. in a manner accompanied by licking of hands." This meaning is verified by the Chinese translations (SV. vii. 78; MSG. vii. 35; MSV. vii. 61; KSY. vii. 56): "to lick hands." However, DH. vii. 44; MHS. vii. 63 peculiarly give "to lick the food."

27. *hastāvadhūnakam* (*BHS Dict.* 72b) "adv. with waving of the hands." In SV. vii. 81; DH. vii. 45; MSG. vii. 41; MHS. vii. 72; MSV. vii. 62, the usage of *chen* for waving (hands) is not recorded in the classical Chinese literature.

KUN CHANG

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

The Pathans, 550 B.C.–A.D. 1957. By OLAF CAROE. Pp. xxii + 521. New York: ST. MARTIN'S PRESS, 1958.

Sir Olaf Caroe well represents the British tradition of combining public service and scholarship. Educated at Oxford, he entered the Indian Civil Service in 1917 and the Political Department of the Government of India in 1923. For ten years thereafter he was a political officer in the North West Frontier Province and rose to be its Chief Secretary (1933-34). Subsequently he was the Government of India's Officiating Resident in the Persian Gulf and, through World War II, The Secretary of the External Affairs Department at New Delhi. He capped his career with the governorship of the North West Frontier Province, 1946-47. Since then he has written three scholarly books: *Wells of Power*, a study of the Persian Gulf area in its geopolitical context; *Soviet Empire*, a study of Muslim Central Asia; and now *The Pathans*, a study of the tribes of the North West Frontier. (Some of the material in the volume under review deals with the Pathans of Baluchistan—they comprise about half the population of that region—and with the related tribes in eastern and western Afghanistan. But the bulk of the work is devoted to the North West Frontier area, which was a distinct Province from 1901 to 1955 and is now merged into the single administrative unit of West Pakistan, with its capital at Lahore.)

In scope and organization, *The Pathans* is the best single reference work on the history of the North West Frontier area. It carries no bibliography, a regrettable omission, but has adequate notes, a full index, and appendices. It is illustrated with maps and some unusual plates. Of particular charm are the translations from the Pashtu of several poems by Khushhal Kahn Khatak, the national poet of the Pathans, who lived in the seventeenth century.

The first half of the book consists of a thorough examination of early references to the people of the Frontier, from the early Achaemenian period down until the rise of the Durrani Afghan empire in the eighteenth century. The legends of the Pathans themselves are considered in detail. The passage of Alexander the Great across the Frontier is clarified. Then follows a painstaking effort to collect actual or possible references to the area (particularly Peshawar) during the era of the Mauryas, the Graeco-Bactrians, the Sakas, the Parthians, the Kushans, the Sassanians, the White Huns, the early Muslims, and the "Muslim Middle Ages" (delimited as from A.D. 1000 to 1707). No rock inscription is left unturned, and even unexcavated mounds are brought into consideration. Historical sources include references in Sanskrit, old and modern Persian, Greek, Chinese, Arabic, and Chaghatai Turki. Certainly this half of the book is authoritative if not definitive.

The latter half of the book is devoted to the periods of the Durrani Afghans, the Sikhs, and the British. Since relatively ample historical material is available on these eras, and since the author assumes that the reader is cognizant of the highlights, and indeed some of the details, this portion of the book takes on more of the aspect of a spot analysis than an ordered chronological ac-

count. What is lost thereby in comprehensiveness is gained in vividness and interest. The author's attraction to the country and to its turbulent people shines through every page. His anecdotes and biographic sketches illumine the Pathan character more than any recital of historic events could do. Others have recounted those events in innumerable accounts of wars, expeditions, negotiations and treaties. Wisely the author limits himself usually to a commentary on the pages of history, thus bringing forth what is, after all, his original contribution—an intimate personal estimate of the trends evolving in a very old and independent way of life.

In his final chapter, entitled "The Pathan Renaissance" the author makes this observation: "The Pathan future is not in doubt; it lies, as it always has lain, with the people of the Indus Valley." He also remarks: "Day-to-day business cannot be conducted with the tribes from Karachi or Lahore." Contrary to what one might expect from these closing remarks, however, he does not devote any close arguments to the merits of the Pakhtunistan question, nor indeed does he deal with post-Partition developments in general except in passing.

HAROLD G. JOSIF
AMERICAN FOREIGN SERVICE

Economic Life Of Northern India In The Gupta Period. By SACHINDRA KUMAR MAITY. Pp. xviii + 223. Calcutta: THE WORLD PRESS, 1957.

The Age of the Guptas, extending from the early fourth to the sixth century A. D., is a period of the highest interest to students of Indian history. This is the era in which, according to W. Norman Brown, "characteristic Indian civilization" emerged. Maity's study is a dissertation accepted for the doctorate at London in 1956. The thesis was done under Professor A. L. Basham, to whom the book is dedicated. In a foreword, Professor Basham writes that Dr. Maity "has marshalled his material in such a way as to throw the maximum possible light on a very dark subject" (p. xvii).

The organization of the book is conventional. The first half is devoted to the land: landholding, land taxes, agriculture and animal husbandry. The other half takes up handicrafts, trade, guilds, money matters, labour and slavery. As is well-known, data pertaining to the economic history of ancient India are scanty and scattered. The best hope for advancing our knowledge of the subject would seem to lie in first posing relevant questions and then, within the limitations of the surviving evidence, formulating, criticizing, and reformulating tentative answers. From this angle of approach Maity's book must be termed disappointing, despite the trouble which he has taken to bring together in one place the heterogeneous materials pertaining to the Gupta economy.

The basis deficiency of Maity's approach may be illustrated by his treatment of "Ownership of land." To this subject he devotes the principal section of his largest chapter, entitled "Land System." During the past hundred years scholars have debated whether the prevailing form of "ownership" in ancient India was State, royal, communal, private, absolute, conditional, or some mixture of these. After reviewing the evidence from the Gupta period, Maity takes the position (by no means novel) that *both* king and peasant simultaneously had rights in the same land. To clinch his argument Maity quotes A. L. Basham's statement: "Most of the villagers were free peasants, and their land was to all intents and purposes their own, though the king claimed its ultimate ownership." From this, Maity goes on to make the extraordinary assertion: "Exactly the same type of land tenureship existed in England from very early times." As his source for the character of the early English tenures, Maity cites the celebrated lectures delivered by F. W. Maitland in 1887-88 and published in 1908, after Maitland's death, under the title, *Constitutional History of England.* In particular, Maity reproduces from Maitland's survey of land law about the end of the thirteenth century the formula: "All land is held of the king. The person who has the right to live on the land and to cultivate it, is a tenant" (pp. 22-23).

It would indeed be a remarkable case of history happening a thousand years ahead of itself if Gupta land law had followed so precisely the pattern of Anglo-Norman England. One might have thought that Maity, having made a discovery of this magnitude, would have proceeded to trace out some of its implications. On the contrary, the quotation from Maitland serves to terminate the section on "Ownership," which is immediately followed by a section on soils, cultivability, gardens, forests, etc.

Thoughtful reading of the two lines from Maitland at once brings into question Maity's far-fetched parallel. The word which Maitland used in referring to the person who held land directly or indirectly of the King of England was not *owner* but *tenant*. Rather than regarding the Saxon cultivators as "free peasants" Maitland had stated in the same lectures: "It seems highly probable that at the date of the Norman Conquest there was a large mass of unfree tenants cultivating lands on much the same terms as those which constitute the villeinage of later days." (*Constitutional History of England*, p. 151).

In any case, the lectures printed in the volume entitled *Constitutional History* should not be taken as the definitive version of Maitland's views on land tenure or ownership. On the same page from which Maity took the quotation on tenure, the editor of Maitland's posthumously published work states: "The subject of this section is treated with greater fullness in the *History of English Law* [by F. Pollock and F. W. Maitland], I, 229-406." This classic work appeared eight years after Maitland delivered his lectures on constitutional history.

It is worthwhile to quote the opening of the paragraph in the *History of English Law* which expands the brief statement quoted by Maity from the *Constitutional History*:

> §1. *Tenure in General.* Every acre of English soil and every proprietary right therein have been brought within the compass of a single formula, which may be expressed thus:—*Z tenet terram illam de.....domino Rege.* The king himself holds land which is in every sense his own; no one else has any proprietary right in it; but if we leave out of account this royal demesne, then every acre is 'held of' the king. The person whom we may call its owner, the person who has the right to use and abuse the land, to cultivate it or leave it uncultivated, to keep all others off it, holds the land of the king either immediately or mediately. (*History of English Law*, second edition, I, 232-33).

We immediately notice that this description forms part of Pollock and Maitland's treatment of *tenure*, and not of their section on *ownership*. Pollock and Maitland preferred to deal with this latter subject much further on, in the second volume of their *magnum opus*. With characteristic deftness they warned the reader that the English language of the thirteenth century "had not the word *ownership*, nor, it may be, the word *owner*. In a sense therefore the law knew no ownership either of land or of goods." (*History of English Law*, second edition, II, 4, n. 2).

If the crucial quotation from Maitland on tenure was to be cited anywhere in Maity's "Land System" chapter, the proper place for it would have been in the fourth section which is entitled "Land Tenure." Here Maity's first sentence concedes that knowledge of Gupta land tenure is "extremely vague and incomplete . . ." (p. 25). It is a pity that Maity's recognition of the inadequacy of his source materials did not make him more circumspect in his analysis. Far from shedding new light, Maity's treatment of Gupta land tenure and ownership adds fresh confusion.

DANIEL THORNER

ÉCOLE PRATIQUE DES HAUTES ÉTUDES, PARIS

Chinese Civilization in Liberal Education; Proceedings of a Conference held at the University of Chicago, November 28, 29 1958. Edited by H. G. CREEL. Pp. viii + 222. Chicago: UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, 1959.

"Homme, libre penseur! te crois-tu seul pensant
Dans ce monde où la vie éclate en toute chose?
Des forces que tu tiens ta liberté dispose,
Mais de tous tes conseils l'universe est absent.
. . . .
Crains dans le mur aveugle, un regard qui t'épie:
A la matière même un verbe est attaché . . .
Ne le fais pas servir à quelque usage empie!
. . ."

Gérard de Nerval, *Vers dorés*

We have here the fossil, better left decently buried, of another vague and diffuse symposium, this time devoted to the question of general courses on China in "liberal" college curricula. It has at least the merit of illustrating a real problem of modern scholarship in presenting, among various points of view, one whose haughty and humorless anti-philological character is remarkably odd in a symposium whose very name comes to us from the Hellenes. Two participating historians represented this attitude most unambiguously, and made themselves decisively felt throughout the proceedings. By way of example, Mr. A. F. Wright expressed concern about ". . . the incubus of philogical [sic!] Orientalism" (p. 121), and Mr. J. K. Fairbank stigmatized (characteristically), as "a degree of philological unrealism unmatched in our annals" the suggestion of another participant that teachers of introductory courses on China should have studied the Chinese language (p. 28). I am automatically prompted to ask whether there are still first-rate colleges which allow courses on Classical Mediterranean civilization (for instance) to be given by professors who own no Greek or Latin, or a course on "France" to be taught by a professor who knows no French? But the problem goes deeper than this. It is obvious that Mr. Wright and Mr. Fairbank regard the methods and subject matter of traditional humane studies as often (or always?) obsolete, trivial, recondite, pedantic, dull, pedestrian and narrow. "Philology" in particular (it is not quite clear what they imagine philology to be) seems to them to exemplify these traits to them. (Before proceeding further, I should remark that a different point of view was strongly represented in this colloquy. For example, Mr. H. G. Creel stood stoutly for the preservation of humane values, and Mr. A. Soper contributed a dignified and valuable essay in the best humane tradition. No one present, however, was so impolite as to describe the realistic social studies advocated by Mr. Wright and Mr. Fairbank, free of the incubus of philology, as often pompous, ephemeral, flimsy, pretentious, inflated, shallow and unauthenticated. Perhaps it was just as well, despite the provocation of Mr. Wright's "incubus.")

The historians who see nothing fantastic and contradictory in a non-linguistic version of the "Humanities" hold unyieldingly to the old view that history is primarily the study of political affairs, and of aspects of life that can be easily related to the operations of governments and the institutionalized quest for power and status.[1] It is this assumption which leads them inevitably (if they specialize in China) to their preoccupation with the hackneyed and ill-defined notion of "Confucianism," with its strong political implications —but, of course, never to the study of the Chinese idea of the *ju*. In the same way, one might write diffusely of "Christian thought" (post-classical European thought?), without ever coming to grips with *logos, homoousios*, the poetry and science of Alcuin, or the symbolism of the orthodox liturgy.

These few taboo-ridden historians of China, in short, find the humanities alien to their understanding, though they can not afford to fail in nominal reverence to them. Their only recourse, then, is to seek formulas to exorcise them. As modern representatives of medieval "realism" (with all modesty, I find myself allied with the "nominalists" in so far as understanding the humanities is concerned), they care little, if at all, about the concrete, the personal, the individual, and the "humane." Such subtle conceptions as tragedy, humor, mortality, illusion, salvation, allegory, irony, sentimentality, obsession, love, myth, prophecy, and renunciation, to name only a few of the aesthetic, moral and intellectual problems

[1] This is not to say that we may reject the now commonplace idea that literature and the arts must be seen in their social and economic setting, nor (contrariwise) need we accept the fallacy that an analysis of the social and economic factors which influence a writer constitute criticism. These battles are now ancient history.

which lie close to the human heart, never really engage their attention. The problem of the irrational and paradoxical in thought and language fails to interest them; mysteries and ambiguities attract them not. They care even less about such small (and intensely human) things as riddles, games, pets, picnics, daydreams, and fashions in flowers, foods, and fighting. Above all, they coldly abjure the investigation of the whole marvelous tapestry of language, in which these conceptions, clothed in rich imagery, are expressed, and they depreciate the arduous technical studies which are crucial to such investigation and give it its power and authority.

I fear that this review begins to look like a didactic tract. Perhaps I am too optimistic in thinking that I can enlighten Mr. Wright and Mr. Fairbank about the meaning of "Humanities." Looking for a test, I went through a pile of reprints sent to me by friends and colleagues, and found the following titles on humanistic subjects, many of them in *philological* journals: "The Imagery of Saint-John Perse's *Neiges*" (*Proceedings of the Modern Language Association of America*); "The Date of Ammianus Marcellinus' Last Books" (*American Journal of Philology*); "Sydenham's Philosophy of Science" (*Osiris*); "Mohammedan Eschatology and Dante's Other World" (*Comparative Literature*); "The Translation of Folk Tales" (*Western Folklore*); "Jules Renard as Critic" (*University of California Publications in Modern Philology*): "Etymology through Maps" (*Folklore Studies*); "The Strangling Figs in Sanskrit Literature" (*University of California Publications in Classical Philology*); "Russian Symbolists: The Mirror Theme and Allied Motifs" (*The Russian Review*); "The Sorrows of Ino and of Procne" (*Transactions of the American Philological Association*); "Taboos on Animal Names" (*Language*); "Propertius and the Roman Career" (*University of California Publications in Classical Philology*); "Old and New Trends in Spanish Linguistics" (*Studies in Philology*); "Locke's Rejection of Hypotheses about Sub-microscopic Events" (*Journal of the History of Ideas*). All of these are humane studies, and most required philological labors. Do Mr. Wright and Mr. Fairbank mean that they are ridiculous and ought to be abandoned, or only that they themselves could do them better? Are the serious students of shop-talk and passions and epiphanies, of noble resolves and fragile images, of recreations, foibles and seemingly idle purposes, of celebrations, oracles and visions, and of the whole universe of the imagination, to be hustled off the stage to dawdle in the wings, while the prophets of a pretentious "humanistic science(!)" claim the undivided attention of the audience?[2] Are the *Journal of Classical Philology* and the *Journal of Romance Philology* to be publicly burned as heretical, along with a hundred similar nightmare publications? Shall the Faculty of Philology of the University of Leningrad, and others like it, be summarily liquidated as subversive? Is it really possible that these few self-sufficient historians, whose generalizations about institutions and "trends" depend in large part for their reliability on systematic and basic research done by scholars in the fields of arts and letters, can regard textual and linguistic studies as pedestrian, and interpretative and critical studies as trivial? It appears to be so.

But the incubus of exact scholarship, which has hovered over "sinology" for some time now, threatens at long last to compel the application of the triumphant methods of Indo-European and Semitic philology, among other humanistic disci-

---

[2] Professor Fairbank has recently proposed that we ". . . abolish the term, 'humanities,' which suggests that such studies are either pre-scientific or anti-scientific and in either case of a lower order. Let us adopt the term in other countries, 'humanistic sciences.'" ("A Note of Ambiguity: Asian Studies in America," *Journal of Asian Studies*, XIX [1959], 8-9). Professor Fairbank still stands in the orthodox shadow of Auguste Comte. "Humanities" is a second-rate category only to scholars who, like himself, are unsympathetic to the humanities. I fear that he will be hard put to find a following for his steel-plated and streamlined "humanistic science" among students of literature, music, philosophy and the arts, most of whom will find the proposal only amusing. He is invited to consult the opinions of the eminent philosopher of science P. W. Bridgman, as summarized by Joseph Wood Krutch, in "Reflections on the Fifties," *Saturday Review*, January 2, 1960, p. 11. Bridgman, says Krutch, ". . . renounced his previous conviction to declare that he no longer believed sociology, ethics, esthetics, or even biology to be subjects which can be profitably studied by the 'positive' methods borrowed from the physical sciences. Thus he reaffirmed precisely what three centuries had tended increasingly to doubt—namely our mysterious, incommensurable humanness." I am ready to support a movement to use the terms "historical letters" and "sociological arts" in order to give real status and dignity to the studies of which Prof. Fairbank approves.

plines, to the study of China, and so to remove it entirely from the hands of amateurs. The rising spirit of professionalism in Far Eastern studies has already begun to give us trained economists, anthropologists, and sociologists in the Chinese field; similarly, on the side of the humanities, trained linguists, philologists, and critics (and there are already a great many of them) can no longer be held off by the recitation of spells: the twentieth century has arrived! The assailants of humane scholarship conceal, under a mantle labelled "Progressivism," what is, I fear, only a sour and reactionary spirit. "If you *must* be literary," these counterrevolutionists seem to say, "confine yourself to writing diverting anthologies and popular abridgments, rich in tinsel abstractions, which we can understand. We will patronize you only as long as you don't bore us with your arcane documents, difficult scripts, and unusual words, and your erudite problems of style and taste. In short, don't try to be as exacting as 'real scientists' are. 'Science' nowadays must be and can afford to be difficult and recondite—but don't you try to be first-rate too!" I think that few humanistic scholars will be persuaded to give up their hard and devoted labors for the cheap esteem of their detractors.

There is general agreement that such College Departments as English, Latin, Slavic Literature, and Romance Philology (to select only a few) properly represent the "Humanities," and that Anthropology, Psychology, Economics and Sociology (for instance) represent the "Social Sciences." But for generations the question "Is History an Art or a Science?" has been debated fruitlessly. The popular contemporary form of this question is "Does History belong in the Humanities or in the Social Sciences?" To propose a third category of "Historical Sciences" (those which reconstruct the past, and would include, I suppose, Palaeontology) might gratify some scholars (me, for instance). Such pleasant questions of taxonomy have a certain casual interest, but are not serious enough to justify careless denunciations, as exemplified by the open contempt for such undoubtedly humanistic studies as philosophy (pp. 152-154) and philology shown by some contributors to these proceedings. The kind of anti-philological history advocated by Mr. Wright and Mr. Fairbank may be very instructive by way of contrast, and may even be worthy of special status and a unique name, and deserve a place in any overall survey of Chinese civilization. But to make it out to be a kind of improved or reformed version of the Humanities, as they seem to do, is merely to indulge in an arrogant and misleading kind of word-play. But if they mean only that they give their allegiance and energetic support to "social history" (an admirable discipline), why can't they simply say so?

Fortunately we who really believe in the Humanities may still keep the essential things, which they plainly do not want—our intense interest in language, that unique and intricate outgrowth of the human spirit, our meticulous scholarship, which they so abhor, our love of biography (the complexities of human beings!), our interest in verbal fabrications and linguistic nuances, our concern for poetic visions, intimate dramas, and hieratic figures, our "cabbages and kings," and even our musty documents. I hope that we may be allowed to go on calling ourselves "humane scholars."

EDWARD H. SCHAFER

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

Prehistoric China. By CHENG TE-K'UN. Pp. xix + 250, 30 text figs., 5 tables, and 44 pls. Volume one of *Archaeology in China.* Cambridge: HEFFER, 1959.

Not much more than three and a half decades ago J. G. Andersson was able to write that in North China "no undoubted evidence of Paleolithic Man has been discovered," and further that "undoubted Neolithic Man can hardly be said to have been proved to occur in these regions."[1] Cheng Te-k'un's latest book is an impressive summary of the work that has been done since that paper appeared in 1923. In that time hundreds

[1] J. G. Andersson, "An early Chinese culture," *Bulletin of the Geological Survey of China,* No. 5 (Peking, 1923), 1.

if not thousands of sites have been discovered and laid bare, and the skeletal remains, stone, bone, shell, and horn artifacts, and pottery shards that have been studied, compared and classified must number in the millions. As a result of the work of a large body of scholars, Chinese, Japanese, European, and American, the overall outlines of the stone age culture of China are gradually beginning to take shape. It would be very misleading to give the impression that all problems have been solved, and one of the admirable things about this book is the sober and conservative way in which the author has presented his material. Anything that might be regarded as a conclusion is couched in the most tentative terms. Nevertheless, Paleolithic and Mesolithic phases have been more or less defined, and the immense complexity of the Chinese Neolithic over the length and breadth of the country has begun to emerge in outline form.

Dr. Cheng Te-k'un, the author, is well qualified for his task. Now lecturer in Chinese Art and Archaeology in the University of Cambridge, he was educated at Yenching University and Harvard, and has engaged in fieldwork in all the provinces of North China and in Fukien and Kuangtung in the South. Among his distinguished posts has been that of Curator of the West China Union University Museum at Ch'eng-tu. His writings on Chinese archaeology are extensive, and with this volume he embarks on a series bearing the general heading *Archaeology in China* which will eventually cover the cultures of Shang, Chou, and Han as well. This book, which sets the stage for those to come, fills a long-felt need.

The study of Chinese prehistory has always been difficult because even those scanty materials that we have lie scattered in periodicals devoted to such a wide variety of subjects as anthropology, archaeology, art, geology, history, natural history, paleontology, philology, sinology, etc. While a few monographic studies are available, they are usually limited to the discussion of one site (e.g. *Cheng-tzu Yai, Pi-tzu-wo*) or else concentrate on the work of one man (e.g. Andersson's *Children of the Yellow Earth* and *Researches into the Prehistory of China*). Now for the first time all this material has been brought together and combined into a single readable text. The range of source materials is indicated by the bibliography of 128 titles, one fifth of which have been published on the Chinese mainland since 1948; in view of the large-scale investigations that have been going on in every province in recent years, this means that Dr. Cheng has not merely repeated the old familiar data in new form, but that he has made much new and important material on Chinese prehistory available to Western readers for the first time.

Opening with a concise survey of geological history, the author lays the foundation for his account of the gradual discovery of human remains from the remote past. Climatic factors, the deposition of soils, the curious failure of the ice age to cover China proper with the glaciers that afflicted comparable latitudes of the northern hemisphere in Pleistocene Times, the development of flora and fauna including *homo sapiens* are all clearly set forth. But the story of man really begins in the second chapter with the accounts of (1) Gigantopithecus and Sinanthropus in South China, (2) the Peking Man, and (3) the Ting-ts'un Man, all lower Paleolithic hominids whose remains were found in Middle Pleistocene strata. Middle Paleolithic cultural remains are thus far limited to the Ordos region and the site of Shui-ting-kou is presented as typical. In upper Paleolithic the God of the Wind prevailed over the God of the Rain and picking up dust from the middle of Asia he deposited it over North China in a blanket of loess sometimes 50 meters thick covering the sand and gravel beds laid down by his adversary in an earlier age. This semi-arid era of wind and dust was very hard on Stone Age man in the North China Plain but did not wipe him out, and one of the most perplexing problems of Chinese prehistory dates from this time. Among the human remains found in another cave at Chou-k'ou-tien, high above the residence of Sinathropus who lived there some 400,000 years earlier, were three well preserved skulls which reveal traits similar to those of Neanderthal man, the modern Eskimo, and the modern Melanesian respectively. This apparently inexplicable situation and the fact that Upper Cave Man, as he is called, had shell artifacts and oolithic hematite which originated hundreds of kilometers away from his home are indices of the state of our knowledge in these matters. The chapter closes with a brief notice of Tzu-yang Man, an Upper Paleolithic resident of Szechuan discovered in 1951, and the fragments found at Lai-pin in 1956.

Mesolithic China, say between 2500 and 500 B. C. was widely populated and the variety of cultural traits is represented here by the following subheadings: (1) the Gobi Dune Dweller, (2) the Djalai-nor Man, (3) the Ku-hsiang-t'un Lake

Dweller, (4) the Chouchia-yu-fang Man, (5) the Szechwan Forest People, and (6) the Kwangsi Cave Dweller. These were the last of the men of the Old Stone Age in China. They lived cut off from their contemporaries in other parts of the Eurasiatic continent by mountains, deserts, and jungles of formidable proportions, and yet there are evidences of cultural links with South and Southeast Asia, and with the Eurasian and Afrasian Steppe and Desert Zones. Surviving the hazardous conditions of topography and climate man emerged from his primitive state divided into two distinct groups: those with a way of life suited to the Steppe and Desert North and those whose lives were attuned to the damp forests of the South. These two cultures lived side by side through Neolithic and into historic times.

No sharp and distinct line separates one period from another, and when the Neolithic began with polished stone tools and the manufacture of pottery as its two distinguishing features, Paleolithic and Mesolithic artifacts continued side by side with these inovations for long periods of time in many places. At this moment of transition, Dr. Cheng finds it convenient to describe two marginal areas: one the Gobi Culture, in itself fairly complex with numerous subdivisions and many puzzling traits, and second Prehistoric Sinkiang which combines a pebble tool culture, Gobi Culture features and painted pottery. Both these groups are important; the simple brownish gray pottery of the Gobi Culture with its occasional stamped, incised, cordmarked, or applied designs (though most of it is plain) is the common ware of the entire circumpolar region; the painted pottery of Sinkiang, the place one might expect to find any links between East and West, shows that the question of influences from Western Asia on the pottery culture of the Far East is not so simple as some scholars have tried to make it. And the fact that it is associated with Microlithic tools as well as with bronze gives an idea of its long duration.

It would be hard to say who coined the phrase "cradle of Chinese civilization" to describe the valley of the Huang-ho, but the fact that it has become a cliché only strengthens its truth. Before coming to the Neolithic age, the author devotes still further space to the geographical features of the area and reverts again to the seesawing struggle between the Wind God and the Rain God that gave this huge area its physical character and provided the setting for the development of its three principal cultures, the Yang-shao, the Lung-shan, and the Hsiao-t'un. Very little is known of the Early Neolithic, and the evidence described mainly concerns the latter part of that age by which time the basin was teeming with people whose livelihood was in farming, supplemented by husbandry of pigs and dogs, and for whom hunting and fishing were minor occupations if not sports. Naturally population figures do not exist but Dr. Cheng gives some striking comparisons between ancient and modern town areas which are highly suggestive. For example: Ch'i-chia-p'ing in Kansu now covers some 35,000 square meters while the area of Neolithic habitations covers 154,000; for Yang-shao-t'sun in Honan the figures are 62,000 (modern) and 243,000 (Neolithic); and for Liang-ch'eng-chen in Shantung they are 80,000 (modern) and 900,000 (Neolithic). And most of the culture deposits range from three to five meters thick indicating longtime occupancy of these large sites.

A detailed analysis of the three main cultures of the Huang-ho basin follows the introductory remarks just mentioned, and as the author's account is already a summary there is no need to digest the same material further here. To give the prospective reader an idea of the scope of the text, we can say that he will find 14 pages on Yang-shao, 9 on Lung-shan, and 15 on Hsiao-t'un. All this is good solid meat and worthy of close study, for somewhere in this mass of material, still pretty much hidden from the human eye, lie the clues to the origins of Chinese dynastic history—Ssu-ma Ch'ien to the contrary notwithstanding.

As the author observes, the painted pottery was perhaps "one of the most outstanding features of the Yang-shao culture"; it was certainly the great artistic achievement of Neolithic China. But the very beauty and elegance of these wares, especially those of the Pan-shan stage which are the finest of all, so excited the imagination of their discoverer and of some of the early art historians who studied them that they gave rise to all sorts of fanciful theories about migrations and cultural contacts between Eastern and Western Asia that have enjoyed wider acceptance than they deserve. Against this sort of thinking Dr. Cheng raises the voice of sober and scholarly caution; a few of his sentences are worthy of full quotation. "All these theories," he writes, "sound most fascinating, but subsequent discoveries of new materials throughout Central and Western Asia, as well as

in other regions of China, discount such a 'straight-line' conclusion. The painted pottery belongs, in practically every case, to a well-established agricultural community, and no migratory nomads seem to have carried this decorated pottery on the back (*sic*) of their animals. The problem of the painted pottery is surely not as simply as we used to think, and it is high time that all these sensational theories are put on a high shelf, if not discarded entirely." To which this reviewer can only say, "Bravo!"

Discussing the Middle Yang-shao, Dr. Cheng takes occasion to regret, as do we all, the field technique of Andersson who sat in Lan-chou and offered cash for such painted pottery as was brought to him, a method which had two unfortunate effects. Not only did it result in the wholesale pillaging of sites and the consequent destruction of all archaeological evidence, it produced a grossly distorted picture of the ceramic situation as a whole in that it yielded almost none of the plain, coarse, undecorated wares which we now know outnumbered the handsome painted pots.[2] As Dr. Cheng notes, there were two exceptions to this for Andersson got into the field to observe the discovery of two graves, at Wa-kuan-tsui and Pien-chia-kou, and the photographs taken, and the data recorded at these two sites are of great value; but he did not in the long run gather enough first hand evidence to prevent him from misinterpretting his material when he attemptel to establish a chronology. Thanks to subsequent field studies we now know that Ch'i-chia which was Andersson's earliest phase is stratigraphically younger than Yang-shao, and that the Ma-ch'ang stage which he placed immediately after Yang-shao has yet to be properly placed in the sequence.

Late Yang-shao is described with Hsin-tien serving as the type site, and the discussion goes on to the Lung-shan culture which flourished in the flood plain of the Huang-ho and was characterized mainly by black pottery. Three principal areas are defined: (a) coastal Shantung, (b) Honan, and (c) the somewhat inexplicably isolated area of Liang-chu near Hangchou. Then comes Hsiao-t'un the third of the three late Neolithic cultures of the Huang-ho basin, named for the type site at the very town in Honan, where Neolithic China became dynastic China so far as we now know. But this all-important historical point is barely noted and we look forward to a full discussion in Dr. Cheng's next volume on the Shang dynasty. The present work is rounded out with chapters on the Prehistoric Yangtse, Prehistoric South China, including Taiwan, and Prehistoric Manchuria with a few sentences to remind us that these continental cultures were projected through Korea to Japan and even appear as trace elements in Kamchatka and the Aleutian Islands.

Supplementing the text are 44 halftone plates with 133 illustrations including topographical features, archaeological sites, stone artifacts and pottery. Some 200 objects are shown in line drawings in 30 text figures, and there are three maps and five charts. The excellent bibliography has already been mentioned, and there is a complete list of Chinese characters covering all Chinese and Japanese personal and place names, terms, and book titles. An extremely detailed index occupies 22 pages at the end.

Dr. Cheng has provided the non-archaeological student of Far Eastern cultures with an excellent account of the early stages of human development in China. For those who wish to plunge further into the problems of Far Eastern prehistory this is a good springboard. As a non-specialist in prehistoric archaeology this reviewer would like to offer one criticism. Most of the pottery illustrations are of pieces long familiar to students of the subject, and while all of these are important it would have increased the usefulness of the book if additional objects from some of the more recent finds could have been added. No doubt this presents difficulties, but anything that could have been done to broaden the representation of pottery types would have helped. Also, the location of the plate descriptions at the beginning of the book makes them awkward to use; and their content could have been enhanced by including the sizes of the objects illustrated. But these are minor criticisms of a book that is bound to take its place as the standard reference work on its subject for years to come.

JOHN ALEXANDER POPE

FREER GALLERY OF ART

[2] An amusing aspect of this situation was described by Andersson himself when he told me some years ago that the local people, knowing of his interest in painted pottery did not hesitate to oblige by painting decorations on some of the plain wares they dug up. This falsification was quickly detected by the soap and water test; any original decoration applied before firing is not easy to wash off.

Selections from Japanese Literature (12th to 19th centuries): Texts with Notes, Transcriptions, and Translations by Members of the Japanese Seminar, School of Oriental and African Studies. General Editor: F. D. DANIELS. Pp. x + 183. London: LUND HUMPHRIES, [1959].

Selections from Japanese Literature is a corporate work published by eleven members of the Japanese Seminar at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. The General Editor is F. J. Daniels, Reader in Japanese. Nine prose pieces are presented. Included are two stories from the *Konzyaku monogatari,* one story from the *Tutumi Tyuunagoñ monogatari,* a section of the *Taiheiki,* the story *Sazareisi* which belongs to the category of *otogizoosi,* two pieces of *haibuñ* from *Huuzoku moñzeñ,* the *kibyoosi* by Iba Kasyoo entitled *Tuuhuu Ise monogatari,* a story from Ueda Akinari's *Ugetu monogatari,* two extracts from Motoori Norinaga's *Tamakatuma,* and two chapters from Kooda Rohañ's *Gozyuu no too.* Of these, the story from the *Tutumi Tyuunagoñ monogatari* and the extracts from *Gozyuu no too* are already known in translation. Since the publication of the present volume, at least one other selection has been published; it is found in Mrs. Helen Craig McCullough's work on the *Taiheiki.*

Particularly useful are the translations from the *Huuzoku moñzeñ, Tuuhuu Ise monogatari,* and *Tamakatuma.* All three have special stylistic qualities which render them interesting from the point of view of Japanese linguistic history. The first is an example of *haibuñ* and is therefore written in a clipped, imagistic style related to that of the *haiku*; the second has a nice slangy quality; and the third comes from the scholastic writings of Motoori Norinaga.

According to the General Introduction, *Selections from Japanese Literature* is intended for students who already possess a knowledge of Japanese and who know "in outline" the grammar of the classical Japanese style. Assuming these competences, the eleven collaborators have done virtually everything that the Western students will require. At the front of the volume are the introductions to the extracts followed by the texts in Japanese and footnotes in English; at the back are Romanized transcriptions of the text paralleled on the opposite page by translations into English. The notes and the transcriptions do not always fill the spaces allotted to them. This makes for a somewhat untidy volume as far as the printing is concerned. Sometimes the user feels that the annotations are too far removed from the translations. Presumably the student reads the Japanese text, both in the original and in transcription, the notes, and the translation all at once, but he is obliged to go back and forth between the two halves of the book. Also, when so much is done for the student, one wonders what the educative process is.

In its way the present volume gives us an insight into Japanese studies as conducted at the School of Oriental and African Studies. The emphasis is on literary texts. To judge from the use of terms like *syuusikei* and *reñtaikei* in the notes, the grammar of the classical Japanese style is described in Japanese terms. On page 98, note 82, the word *yoo-oñ* is used. Perhaps the student is expected to know that this term means "palatalized sounds (or syllables)," but the use of such Japanese words in place of the corresponding English ones, when the latter are perfectly applicable, seems unnecessary. Spellings like *namu, mimu, nameredo,* and *nameri* are used when *nañ, miñ, nañmeredo,* and *nañmeri* would probably be closer to the actual pronunciations. The reduction of *mu* to *ñ* is in fact illustrated in the extract from the *Taiheiki* (page 34, lines 19 and 20) and no doubt goes back to the Heian period. The spellings used in the volume under review therefore tend to agree with Japanese spellings that are orthographic survivals from an earlier age. The poems quoted in the notes on pages 55 and 63 should have been translated. On page 84, the form *tirahora* is given the gloss *mabara ni* for its use in the following passage: *Doozo tirahora oñna no horeru yoo ni sitai mono to omoi.* On page 159 the translation for this passage runs: "wishing to have things arranged, please, so that just a woman here and there may become enamoured." *Tirahora,* it seems clear, is used in a slang sense, and I would be surprised to find that *mabara ni* is (or was) an exact equivalent in this context.

These comments, however, are of minor importance when we consider the general accuracy and usefulness of the introductions to the several extracts, the transcriptions, translations, and notes. It is a pleasure to find that the Englishing of older Japanese literature continues to receive so much

emphasis in England. For an American reader, the British brand of the English language represented in the translations adds greatly to their zestfulness. The extracts from the *Tuuhuu Ise monogatari* are especially recommended. This volume gives a welcome insight into several literary genres that have so far received very little study in the West.

JOSEPH K. YAMAGIWA
THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ages Ago; Thirty-Seven Tales from the Konjaku Monogatari Collection. Translated by S. W. JONES. Pp. xix + 175. Cambridge, Mass.: HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1959.

This book, surely one of the most harum-scarum productions ever issued by a major university press, is addressed to "concentrators on comparative literature . . . , to *Genji* enthusiasts, to tourists familiar with Kyōto and environs, and perhaps to the general reader." Readers of this journal who are of that number may find the animadversions which follow of interest.

The promise of scholarship allied with entertainment, which the foreword holds forth, is soon withdrawn: "So far as can be discovered, this is the first translation into a Western language of any tale from *Konjaku monogatari,* possibly the greatest of all medieval story collections." It is unfortunate that Mrs. Jones, described on the dust-jacket as "a translator in the field of comparative literature," did not discover Satoshi Tsukakoshi's German versions of forty-two tales, published in Zürich in 1956 under the title *Konjaku: Altjapanischen Geschichten aus dem Volk zur Heian-Zeit,* or Robert Brower's three-volume dissertation (Ann Arbor, 1952) entitled *The Konzyaku Monogatarisyu: An Historical and Critical Introduction, with Annotated Translations of Seventy-Eight Tales* (University Microfilms, publication no. 3724). An English counterpart to Mr. Tsukakoshi's popular volume would have been most welcome, particularly one embodying Dr. Brower's careful researches.

The translations offered by Mrs. Jones are maladroit beyond anything in this reviewer's experience. They are written in a stillborn prose having neither literal accuracy nor imaginative fidelity to recommend it, interlarded with raffish colloquialisms bearing no relation to the somewhat doltish humors of the original and evidently the products of a naive trust in fortuitous correspondences. Mrs. Jones regularly translates the intensive *kagirinashi,* for example, as "no end." Emperors are "old-time," warriors "topnotch," and Vajra the Deformed prays, "Shakkamuni Buddha, please turn me beautiful fast and let me attend father's services." A pair of tales included to illustrate medieval Japanese bawdry are grotesquely garbed in medical language, while grosser indecencies enter unbidden through innocent wormholes in the transmitted manuscripts: "He bolted the doors, had numerous persons light lamps, and [1 character lacuna] all through the building, but nothing came of it." The *Konjaku monogatari* requires in translation only a plain, reportorial style, the original being in a vernacular Japanese straitjacketed by Chinese notation and a homely purpose: there is reason to believe the compilation was made to serve as a mammoth prompt-book. The locution "*to nan kataritsutaetaru to ya,*" with which the tales almost invariably conclude, wants an especially light touch in view of its weak syntactic connection; anything but the excruciating inversions which are Mrs. Jones' solution: "Yoshitada did compose poems, but that it was a mistake for him to go uninvited because he heard that poets were invited and thus lay himself open to shame and general derision and make himself a fable for future generations is the tale that has been handed down."

The translator provides also a section of commentary, which she calls "Background Points," and a detailed catalogue of "Sources and Related Texts" printed or cited by Haga Yaichi in his *Kōshō Konjaku monogatari.* Of the latter she says inexplicably that it "presents . . . apparatus of a type which would only be possible in the character-languages, namely the reproduction in full of sources and other related documents." There follows a piece of information even more arresting: "Dr. Haga describes his basic text as a

manuscript book of obvious age though uncertain provenance, twelve inches by ten, written on 'thin wild-goose skin.'" And on p. 138 there is a reference to the death of "scattered junior fifth rank lower grade Ason Kudara Kawanari." No attempt is made to explain that Dr. Haga's manuscript was written on a common thin paper made of *gampi* bark, or that a "scattered" official is one on the inactive list. One hesitates to impute reasons for a refusal either to footnote such technicalities or to be less misleadingly literal in their translation, when so much space has been found for bits of irrelevant information, such as that tendered on p. 118 in reference to the *go* board, that "in the autumn of 1956, the youngest freshman ever admitted to Harvard appeared on newspaper front pages holding one." Even English language sources are not proof against misrepresentation. The paragraph on p. 138 concerning the marketplaces of early Kyoto manages, through a misreading of Dr. Ponsonby-Fane, to be wholly misinformative, the author having failed to understand that the "Right Capital" (*Ukyō*) lay on the right hand, not of the map-reader looking north, but of the Emperor, looking south.

The book is, alas, very attractively printed.

CHARLES E. HAMILTON
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

Japanese Prints from the Early Masters to the Modern. By JAMES A. MICHENER, with the cooperation of the Honolulu Academy of Arts. Illustrated. Pp. 287. 257 plates, 50 in color. Rutland (Vt.) and Tokyo: CHARLES E. TUTTLE COMPANY, 1959.

Japanese Prints seems to be directed especially to the prospective, and relatively uninitiated, collector of prints. In an effort to inspire future print collectors, the author has used his own collection as a point of departure. The book is at once a kind of catalogue of the writer's collection and the framework for a number of brief essays of a popular nature on Japanese prints. These essays are written in a light and extremely colloquial style. They are always strongly oriented toward such problems as the price and availability of prints for the person who may wish to start his own collection today. It is Mr. Michener's thesis that, contrary to the commonly held opinion that Japanese prints have long since become the monoply of a few wealthy collectors, prints of all types are constantly coming on the market, collections are being broken up and sold, thus providing prints at prices acceptable to a collector with relatively modest funds at his disposal.

The aim of this volume is not primarily to instruct the reader in the basic facts concerning prints and their makers. This Mr. Michener has done before in both *The Floating World* (1954) in which he provided a good deal of basic historical information about prints, using the artists and their lives as a point of departure; and in the *Hokusai Sketchbooks* (1958) in which he treated the *manga* of the artist in question. Both books have a great deal of practical information. In the present volume, then, the author has largely eschewed detailed notation, and hence duplication, of information available elsewhere. Notes on individual prints are gathered together in a body at the end of the volume and do not intrude on the text, but they are available when needed. They are in general brief and factual, giving translations of inscriptions, seals, and information on provenance, present condition, and colors. Minor imperfections occur but do not seriously marr the book: color prints reproduced in black and white are not always satisfactory (e. g., print 47); bibliography form is inconsistent and incomplete; pages 97 to 104 repeat; and in the notes on prints 255-56, the Sino-Japanese transliterations Ubari and Kasen'en are given with no mention of the Sanskrit: Upāli and [Mahā]kātyāyana respectively. Moreover, it is an oversimplification in view of the incoherent and contradictory traditions concerning the role of Upāli in the formation of the *vinaya* to say that he "compiled the first monastic rules" (p. 282). Also I do not understand from the note on print 256 just why Mahākātyāyana resembles Munakata's father. On the other hand, color plates are splendid, and anyone

with the slightest inclination for collecting these "magnificient scraps of paper" will doubtless be inspired by Mr. Michener's enthusiasm. Moreover, technically the book is of a very high quality.

The volume spans print making from its beginnings in the seventeenth century to 1958, a year represented by Kawano Kaoru's "Girl in Shell." It is thus possible to observe the evolution which has taken place in this art, its beginnings, apogee, and decline, and its modern renaissance. One of the most interesting sections is the one dealing with moderns. Frequently traditional collections have tended to end with Hiroshige, who logically represents the *terminus ad quem* of the tradition beginning in the 1670s. Actually, Hiroshige is a kind of *terminus a quo* at the same time, for although there is an undeniable decline in print making, the art did continue after him, and it was not always so devoid of merit as it is frequently implied. With such artists as Kiyochika (1847-1915), Goyō (1880-1921), and Shinsui (b. 1896), the floating-world prints come to an end. Print making, however, does not stop. Rather, such modern artists as Onchi (1891-1955) and Yamaguchi (b. 1903) revitalize the prints and bring them into the mainstream of modern, "international" art.

One witnesses the end of *ukiyo-e* with the same melancholy with which one views the passing of anything which has proved itself pleasing and satisfying. Yet, as Michener points out, it would not only be pretentious, but singularly biased, to deny to Japanese moderns the freedom of subject and treatment accorded as a matter of course to Occidentals. Just as one scarcely demands of Chagall a sterile repetition of, say, traditional Russian icons, so one can hardly expect an Onchi to rework the long-gone floating world of eighteenth century Japan. This, of course, does not mean that traditions should be ignored. In fact, this reviewer finds the modern working of themes fundamental in Japan, such as Munakata Shikō's *Ten Great Disciples of the Buddha*, of which two prints close the volume, and Maekawa Sempan's *Akita Dancer* are wonderfully vibrant and meaningful. They are more significant for this reviewer than the Onchi examples, which have nothing specificially Japanese in their abstractions, but rather follow in the traces of international abstract art. But then, Mr. Michener would surely have much to say about what he would call the present reviewer's "tourist approach to art criticism"—and doubtless with reason.

Besides the moderns, which form section four of the volume, *Japanese Prints* begins with a section on early prints and their makers. Since these prints are *sumizuri-e*, they lose little by being reproduced in black and white, for the essence of their aesthetic appeal lies in the flowing lines and the compositional black and white blocks. Section two, however, which is devoted to the full-color prints, is perhaps less satisfactory since it has not been possible to reproduce every plate in color. This means that some of the color prints must be judged purely according to line and composition, and this is not entirely adequate. It is obvious, however, that full-color plates would have made the volume prohibitively expensive. Section three is devoted to landscapes and figure prints and includes Hokusai, Hiroshige, and others. Each section is preceded by a general introduction in which the author provides essential technical information for the understanding of a specific group of prints. Then, the pictures of each artist are introduced by roughly a page of text in which the author makes a few personal remarks on them. In these sections, as in others, he does not hesitate to refer freely to plates both preceding and following the point of text in question, and although this necessitates a considerable leafing through the volume, rather than constituting a nuisance, it served to make this reviewer, at least, increasingly familiar with the evolution of the prints as a whole. The text is held to a minimum, and the plates are left to charm the observer, which they do not fail to do.

Although Mr. Michener has produced an enjoyable book, which reflects his infectious enthusiasm for the prints of Japan, a final word of praise must go to the publishers for their part in creating a work of quality.

E. Dale Saunders

University of Pennsylvania

American Oriental Society

THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY was founded in 1842 for the promotion of Oriental studies, the encouragement of research in Eastern languages and literatures, and the publication of books and papers dealing with these subjects. It is not necessary for any one to be a professed Orientalist in order to become a member. All persons—men or women—who are in sympathy with the objects of the Society are invited to give it their help in the furthering of its work. Persons desiring to become members are requested to apply to the Secretary-Treasurer, Prof. Ferris J. Stephens, 329 Sterling Memorial Library, Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. Members receive the JOURNAL without charge. The annual assessment is $7. Life Membership may be obtained at any time by a donation of $150 less one half the amount already paid in annual assessments.

CAPITALIZED FUNDS

Charles W. Bradley Fund	$ 3,000.00	Louise Wallace Hackney Scholarship Fund	50,768.55
Alexander I. Cotheal Fund	1,500.00	Ludlow Bull Fund	1,000.00
I. M. Casanowicz Fund	150.00	Charles J. Ogden Fund	5,000.00
Justin E. Abbott Fund	7,650.00	Prudential Fund	1,000.00
Life Membership Fund	7,941.64	James B. Nies Fund (capital held in trust)	
William Dwight Whitney Fund	1,000.00		
Centennial Fund	$ 2,000.00		

The attention of the members of the Society is especially called to these Funds, the interest of which is used towards defraying the Society's expenses of publication. Gifts or legacies for this purpose will mean much for Oriental research in America. The corporate title of the Society is THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY (incorporated under the laws of Massachusetts).

LIBRARY

The Society's Library is deposited with the Library of Yale University, where its volumes may be consulted by members and by other persons receiving the permission of the Librarian. A catalog has been prepared, and is now available in printed form for distribution to the members of the Society; it may be had for one dollar, plus postage, from the Librarian (Professor James T. Babb, The Library, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.). The facilities of the Library are available to members wherever they may be located and the Librarian is ready to lend such books as are needed. He will be pleased to receive documents relating to the history of the Society, particularly letters of distinguished former members. (See vol. 56, p. 428 of the JOURNAL for By-laws relating to the Library, vol. 77, pp. 294-295 for the newly adopted Library Rules.)

Journal of the American Oriental Society

Now issued quarterly. Subscription price, $8.00; for Libraries ordering direct from the Society, $7.00. Single numbers, $2.00. Prices of back volumes and parts, so far as not out of print will be sent on application. Members of the Society and Libraries are allowed 20% discount from list prices on back numbers.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

American Oriental Series

* Volume 4. Jambhaladatta's Version of the Vetālapañcaviñsati. By Murray B. Emeneau. 1934. Price $3.00.

Volume 8. A Grammar of the Phoenician Language. By Zellig S. Harris. 1936. Price $3.50.

* Volume 9. The Kashmirian Atharva Veda Bks. 16 and 17. By LeRoy C. Barret. 1936. Price $3.50.

Volume 12. A Census of Indic Manuscripts in the United States and Canada. By Horace I. Poleman. 1938. Pp. xxvii, 542, cloth bound, photo-offset reproduction. Price $2.00.

Volume 14. The Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi. By Albrecht Goetze. Pp. xii, 129, cloth bound. Price $2.00.

Volume 15. The Basis of Israelite Marriage. By Millar Burrows. Pp. viii, 72, paper bound. Price $1.50.

Volume 17. Statesman, Patriot, and General in Ancient China. By Derk Bodde. 1940. Pp. xii, 75, cloth bound. Price $1.50. Three *Shih Chi* biographies of the Ch'in Dynasty, 255-206 B. C.

Volume 18. The Kashmirian Atharva Veda, Books 19 and 20. By LeRoy C. Barret. 1940. Price $2.50.

Volume 20. Report on the Chanhu-daro Excavations. 1935-36. By Ernest J. H. Mackay. 1943. Pp. xv, 338; 96 plates, cloth bound. Price $6.00.

Volume 21. Manuscript Illustrations of the Uttarādhyayana Sūtra. Reproduced and described by W. Norman Brown. 1941. Pp. xiii, 54, with 150 figures on 46 plates, cloth bound. Price $3.00.

Volume 23. Anthropological Bibliography of Negro Africa. By H. A. Wieschhoff. 1948. Pp. xi, 461, cloth bound, photo-offset reproduction. Price $7.00.

Volume 24. Palestinian Figurines in Relation to Certain Goddesses Known through Literature. By James B. Pritchard. 1943. Pp. 99, with two pages of figures, paper bound. Price $1.75.

Volume 25. Nuzi Real Estate Transactions. By Francis R. Steele. 1943. Pp. 83, paper bound. Price $1.75.

Volume 26. Aḥmad B. at-Ṭayyib as-Sarahsī. By Franz Rosenthal. 1943. Pp. 135, paper bound. $3.00.

Volume 27. Lu Hsiang-Shan. By Siu-Chi Huang. 1944. Pp. 116, paper bound. Price $2.00.

Volume 28. Gafat Documents. Records of a South-Ethiopic Language. By Wolf Leslau. 1945. Grammar, Text, and Comparative Vocabulary. Price $3.50.

Volume 29. Mathematical Cuneiform Texts. By O. Neugebauer and A. Sachs. 1945. Price $5.00.

Volume 30. Roots, Verb Forms, and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language. By William Dwight Whitney. 1945. A reproduction of the original. Price $1.50.

Volume 31. Manhaj as-Sālik: Abū Ḥayyān's Commentary on the Alfiyya of Ibn Mālik. Edited with an Introduction by Sidney Glazer. 1947. Price $10.00.

Volume 32. Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets of the Wilberforce Eames Babylonian Collection in the New York Public Library. By A. Leo Oppenheim. 1948. Pp. xvi, 271; 15 plates, paper bound. Price $5.00.

Volume 33. Old Persian Grammar Texts Lexicon. By Roland G. Kent. 1950. 2d Rev. Ed. 1953. Pp. xi, 219, cloth bound. Price $7.50.

Volume 34. The Narrative of Bhoja (Bhojaprabandha) by Ballāla of Benares. By Louis H. Gray. 1950. Pp. viii, 109, cloth bound. Price $3.25. Paper bound. Price $2.25.

Volume 35. Abū Ja'far Muḥammad B. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī's The Reign of Al-Mu'taṣim (833-842). Translated and annotated by Elma Marin. 1951. Pp. xvii, 142, cloth bound. Price $3.50.

Volume 36. Early Hebrew Orthography: a Study of the Epigraphic Evidence. By Frank Moore Cross, Jr. and David Noel Freedman. 1952. Pp. viii, 77, cloth bound. Price $2.50.

Volume 37. Kassitenstudien. 1. Die Sprache der Kassiten. By Kemal Balkan. 1954. Pp. xiv, 238, paper bound, photo-offset printing. Price $4.50.

Volume 38. The Idea of History in the Ancient Near East. Edited by Robert C. Dentan. Published by the Yale University Press for the American Oriental Society, 1955. Pp. ix, 376, cloth bound. Price $5.00.

Volume 39. The Ḥab/piru. By Moshe Greenberg. 1955. Pp. xiii, 96, paper bound, photo-offset printing. Price $3.50.

Volume 40. Index to Journal of the American Oriental Society, Volumes 21 to 60. Compiled by Edward H. Schafer, Isidore Dyen, Helen E. Fernald, and Harold W. Glidden. 1955. Pp. vii, 173, paper bound, photo-offset printing. Price $2.50.

Volume 41. A Bushman Dictionary. By Dorothea F. Bleek. 1956. Pp. [viii,] 773, paper bound, photo-offset printing. Price $8.50.

Volume 42. The Language of the Secret History of the Mongols. By John Charles Street. 1957. Pp. vii, 89, paper bound, photo-offset printing. Price $3.50.

Volume 43. Early Mesopotamian Royal Titles: A Philologic and Historical Analysis. By William W. Hallo. 1957. Pp. [x,] 166, paper bound, photo-offset printing. Price $3.00.

Volumes in this series are printed from type unless otherwise indicated. * These volumes are specially priced at $1.00.

AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY OFFPRINT SERIES

2. A. S. Halkin, The Hashwiyya . . . . . 40 cents
3. C. A. Owen, Arabian Wit and Wisdom from Abu Sa'id al-Abi's Kitāb Nathr al-Durar . 50 cents
6. J. Obermann, Political Theology in Early Islam $1.00
8. Albrecht Goetze, The Tenses of Ugaritic . . 75 cents
9. J. Obermann, The Archaic Inscriptions from Lachish $1.00
12. J. Obermann, Votive Inscriptions from Ras Shamra . . . . . 50 cents
15. G. Levi Della Vida, Muhammad Ibn Habīb's "Matronymics of Poets" . . . . . 25 cents
16. Franklin Edgerton, A Critically Edited Text of Nala, 1-5 . . . . . 10 cents
18. Wolf Leslau, Short Grammar of Tigré $1.00
19. Franklin Edgerton, Sanskrit Historical Phonology 50 cents
20. J. Obermann, How Daniel was Blessed with a Son . . . . . 75 cents
21. G. S. Lane, The Tocharian Punyavantajātaka: Text and Translation . . . . . 75 cents
22. Harry M. Orlinsky, Notes on the Qal Infinitive Construct and the Verbal Noun in Biblical Hebrew . . . . . 75 cents
23. J. Obermann, How Baal Destroyed a Rival: A Mythological Incantation Scene . . . . . 75 cents
26. J. Obermann, Discoveries at Karatepe: A Phoenician Royal Inscription from Cilicia . . $1.00
27. E. Y. Kutscher, New Aramaic Texts . . . . 75 cents
28. Ludwik Sternbach, Cāṇakya's Aphorisms in the Hitopadeśa (I-IV) $1.25